Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 88-507
H. R. 11296

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 11296 1
Digest of Public Law 88-507 2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 11296

May	18, 1964	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 11296. H. Report No. 1413. Print of bill and report.
May	20, 1964	House began debate on H. R. 11296.
May	21, 1964	House passed H. R. 11296 with amendment.
May	22, 1964	H. R. 11296 was referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
July	27, 1964	Senate subcommittee voted to report H. R. 11296.
July	30, 1964	Senate committee reported H. R. 11296 with amendments. Senate report 1269. Print of bill and report.
Aug.	5, 1964	Senate passed H. R. 11296 as reported.
		Senate conferees were appointed.
		Print of bill as passed by Senate.
Aug.	11, 1964	House conferees were appointed.
Aug.	12, 1964	House received conference report on H. R. 11296. H. Report No. 1781. Print of report.
Aug.	13, 1964	House agreed to conference report.
Aug.	14, 1964	Senate agreed to conference report.
Aug.	30, 1964	Approved: Public Law 88-507.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 88-507

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1965.

Includes funds for the Office of Emergency Planning, including $4,190,000 to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions; Office of Science and Technology; President's disaster relief fund; Department of Defense to develop measures and plans for civil defense, including shelter surveys, marking, and stocking; Civil Service Commission; Federal Power Commission; Federal Trade Commission; General Services Administration; Housing and Home Finance Agency; Interstate Commerce Commission; National Science Foundation; Selective Service System; and Veterans Administration.

with violations of such rules and regulations need not be tried before a U. S. district court but may be tried by a U. S. commissioner specially designated for that purpose by the appropriate district court. p. 10758

13. MILK. Passed as reported H. R. 9747, to extend for 3 years, to December 31, 1967, the authority for donations of price-supported dairy products (including milk) for increased consumption by military personnel, veterans hospital patients, and personnel of the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies. pp. 10757-8

14. STOCKPILING. Passed without amendment H. R. 10774, to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed six-month waiting period, of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. p. 10759

15. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 11296 (H. Rept. 1413). p. 10795

16. ALASKA; DISASTER RELIEF. Passed without amendment S. 2772, to authorize $23,500,000 for additional transitional grants to Alaska and to extend to June 30, 1966, the time in which Federal agencies may provide interim services and facilities to the State. This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar bill, H. R. 11037, which had been passed earlier under suspension of the rules, was tabled. pp. 10760-2

17. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Rep. Mahon was elected chairman of the Appropriations Committee. p. 10754

18. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received the President's message requesting additional funds for military and economic assistance to Vietnam (H. Doc. 307). pp. 10754-5, 10842-3

19. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Purcell charged that imported frozen meat which is later thawed, processed, and refrozen is a "health hazard," stated that this Department "now says it is their opinion that once food has completely thawed to a temperature of 36° or higher, it is not likely to be fit for refreezing," and urged action "to correct the present deplorable situation." pp. 10793-4

20. WILDERNESS. Rep. Saylor paid tribute to the late Howard Zahniser, executive director of the Wilderness Society. pp. 10790-1

21. PERSONNEL. Rep. Nelsen criticized "the high-pressure selling of $100 campaign dinner tickets to civil service employees" by the Democratic National Committee and inserted two items on the subject. p. 10783

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. WHEAT; FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Derwinski stating that "today the State Department negotiators, led by Ambassador Harriman, had discussions which will lead to subsidy of the Communist Government of Rumania," and inserting an article, "Report from Rome: Sale of Wheat to Russians Harms U. S. Image Abroad." pp. A2577-8

23. APPALACHIA; AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Alger inserted an editorial critical of the area redevelopment and proposed Appalachia programs as leading to "national bankruptcy." p. A2567

24. PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell commending the President's opposition to enactment of proposed "quality stabilization" legislation. pp. A2585-7

25. AUTOMATION. Rep. St. George inserted an address by the assistant to the administrative vice president of the U. S. Steel Corp. reviewing the effects of automation, "Automation and Technological Unemployment: Problem or Mirage?" pp. A2549-52

26. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Gurney inserted article, "While Customers Enjoy Low Prices Cattlemen Suffer as Meat Imports Climb." pp. A2554-5

Extension of remarks of Rep. Nelsen inserting an item which he claims bears out his prediction that the Senate would act on proposals to restrict beef imports but the proposals would be lost in the House. p. A2561

27. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Evins inserted an editorial, "TVA's Expansion Raises Profits in Many Places." p. A2555

Extension of remarks of Rep. Roybal expressing his concern with the water shortage and the supply of electric power in the Colo. River system. pp. A2565-6

28. YOUNG FARMERS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Andrews (N.D.) commending the selection of outstanding young farmers by the U. S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. pp. A2555-6

BILLS INTRODUCED

29. LIVESTOCK. H. R. 11272, by Rep. Olson, Minn., to assure orderly marketing of an adequate supply of livestock products; to encourage increased domestic consumption of livestock products; to maintain the productive capacity of the livestock industry; to avoid the feeding of livestock to undesirable weights; and to prevent declines in live-weight prices received by livestock producers; to Agriculture Committee.

30. COMMODITY EXCHANGE. H. R. 11278, by Rep. Cooley, to amend the Commodity Exchang Act, as amended; to Agriculture Committee.

31. ONIONS. H. R. 11288, by Rep. White, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit the issuance of marketing orders for onions for canning or freezing; to Agriculture Committee.

32. LOANS. S. 2852, by Sen. Bible, for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.; to Judiciary Committee. Remarks of author, p. 10800

33. RESEARCH. S. 2853, by Sen. Humphrey, to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy; to Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. Remarks of author, pp. 10800-2

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS:

May 19: Poverty program, H. Education and Labor (exec). Appalachia program, H. Public Works (Labor, Treasury, SBA, and TVA to testify). Irish potato allotment and quota bill, H. Agriculture(exec).

May 26: Operation of rules and regulations pertaining to pesticides, H. Agriculture (Clarkson, ARS, to testify).

oOo

88TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1413

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

MAY 18, 1964.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11296]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The budget estimates considered in connection with the bill are contained in the sections of the appendix to the budget for 1965 on the following pages:

	Pages
Executive Office of the President	48–53
Funds Appropriated to the President (disaster relief)	57
Department of Defense (civil defense)	303–306
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (emergency health activities)	435–436
Federal Aviation Agency	683–694
General Services Administration	695–726
Housing and Home Finance Agency	727–764
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	765–772
Veterans Administration	773–797
Other Independent Offices	801–892

The Committee also considered requests for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1964 and budget amendments for 1965 contained in House Document Nos. 195, 203, 240, and 304.

Summary of the Bill

In the accompanying bill the Committee is recommending the appropriation of $13,318,965,500 for twenty-five independent agencies and offices. This is $925,719,900 less than the budget estimates of $14,244,685,400, or an overall saving of 6.5 percent. In some agencies it will provide for substantially less employment than in the current year, and it will require greater economy and more efficient operation from them all.

The following table summarizes the budget estimates and appropriations recommended in the bill for each agency.

Summary of appropriations and estimates

Agency or item	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimate
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$525,000	$500,000	−$25,000
Office of Emergency Planning	13,700,000	9,975,000	−3,725,000
Office of Science and Technology	950,000	880,000	−70,000
Disaster Relief	20,000,000	20,000,000	
Civil Defense (DOD)	358,000,000	89,200,000	−268,800,000
Civil Defense (HEW)	9,539,000	8,500,000	−1,039,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	93,599,000	89,440,000	−4,159,000
Civil Service Commission	115,025,000	114,505,000	−520,000
Federal Aviation Agency	831,850,000	775,249,000	−56,601,000
Federal Communications Commission	16,610,000	16,310,000	−300,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	[1] *(17,458,000)*	[1] *(17,015,000)*	[1] *(−443,000)*
Federal Power Commission	13,335,000	12,180,000	−1,155,000
Federal Trade Commission	13,270,000	12,725,000	−545,000
General Services Administration.	631,529,400	565,260,100	−66,269,300
Housing and Home Finance Agency	434,690,000	262,362,400	−172,327,600
Federal National Mortgage Association	[1] *(8,800,000)*	[1] *(8,500,000)*	[1] *(−300,000)*
Federal Housing Administration	[1] *(90,125,000)*	[1] *(84,000,000)*	[1] *(−6,125,000)*
Public Housing Administration	230,670,000	215,484,000	−15,186,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	25,850,000	25,260,000	−590,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,445,000,000	5,200,000,000	−245,000,000
National Capital Housing Authority	37,000	37,000	
National Science Foundation	487,620,000	420,400,000	−67,220,000
Renegotiation Board	2,600,000	2,600,000	
Securities and Exchange Commission	15,325,000	14,680,000	−645,000
Selective Service System	43,020,000	39,440,000	−3,580,000
Veterans Administration	5,441,941,000	5,423,978,000	−17,963,000
Total	14,244,685,400	13,318,965,500	−925,719,900

[1] Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

TRAVEL AND PRINTING

Last year the Committee suggested that each agency review carefully its spending for travel and printing. It is noted that considerable savings have been achieved from the amounts that were originally proposed for such expenses in the budget estimates. However, the Committee is of the opinion that in many instances expenditures for these purposes are still excessive and urges that continued surveillance be maintained in order to reduce these costs further.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

National Aeronautics and Space Council

The Committee recommends $500,000 for this activity, which is a reduction of $25,000 in the budget estimate. This will provide for a staff level of about 30 positions, or 2 less than in the current fiscal year. The function of the Council is to advise and assist the President, as he may request, in the fields of aeronautics and space.

Office of Emergency Planning

Salaries and expenses.—An appropriation of $4,285,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of the Office of Emergency Planning, or $1,415,000 less than the budget estimate. This provides for a staff of 275, or 25 fewer jobs than in 1964. The Committee has allowed the full request of $250,000 for telecommunications research. The $1,050,000 proposed for other research and development projects is specifically disallowed. Only 10 of the 19 positions now engaged in reviewing and establishing stockpile objectives for strategic materials are recommended for next year as this activity clearly appears to be overstaffed.

State and local preparedness.—The bill includes $1,500,000 requested for the second of a two-year program of grants to States and local governments to develop programs related to the management of natural, industrial and other resources at the local level in time of emergency. These grant funds are augmented by State and local funds and personnel.

Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.—The Committee recommends $4,190,000 to carry out civil defense and defense mobilization functions delegated to Federal agencies by executive order under the general guidance and review of the Office of Emergency Planning. This is $2,310,000 less than the budget estimate and continues the present level of appropriation for another year. Allocations of funds to various agencies are to be made by OEP in the same manner as in previous years.

Office of Science and Technology

An appropriation of $880,000 is recommended for this office to provide advisory assistance and staff support to the President in developing policies and evaluating programs in science and technology. In performing these functions, the services of some 300 expert consult-

ants in the fields of science and engineering are called upon to provide judgments and evaluations as required. The amount for 1965 is $70,000 less than the budget estimate.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $20,000,000 for disaster relief assistance to States and local governments in the event of major disasters. The program is administered by the Office of Emergency Planning under a delegation of authority from the President. A special appropriation of $50,000,000 was provided earlier in the session when the fund became depleted due to the disaster in Alaska.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Defense

Operation and maintenance.—The bill includes $70,000,000 to continue the present level of funding for established programs of civil defense. This is $22,400,000 less than the budget estimate. The bill again earmarks $15,000,000 for matching grants to States and local civil defense organizations in support of personnel and administrative expenses. A limitation of $13,500,000 is included for management expenses. This provides for a staff of 1,000 positions, which is 62 less than in 1964.

Research, shelter survey and marking.—An appropriation of $19,200,000 is recommended for this item, including $9,200,000 to locate and mark additional shelter spaces and $10,000,000 for continuing civil defense studies and research. The entire fallout shelter program is under study and review by the Department of Defense at the present time and the Committee recommends no additional funds for stocking shelter supplies or new programs proposed in the budget.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Emergency Health Activities

The bill provides $8,500,000 to maintain the present stockpile of medical supplies and emergency hospitals, and for emergency health training activities. No new funds are provided nor were any requested for procuring additional emergency hospitals. This largely accounts for the decline of $19,000,000 in funding from the current year. An unobligated balance of $14,000,000 is expected to be carried over into 1965.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Aeronautics Board

The $10,440,000 provided for salaries and expenses of the Board continues the same level of funding as in the current year except for the cost of pay act increases.

The $79,000,000 recommended for subsidy payments to air carriers is the same amount as has been appropriated to date for the current fiscal year. It is $3,824,000 less than the budget estimate. The Committee expects the Board to continue to review in detail the expenses of subsidized carriers to effect economies wherever possible consistent with good management and safety. The budget estimate of $3,000,000 is allowed for helicopter subsidies, which is intended to provide $1,000,000 for each of the 3 carriers presently receiving such payments.

Civil Service Commission

Salaries and expenses.—An appropriation of $21,805,000 is approved for salaries and expenses of the Commission, an amount identical to the present appropriation. The Committee feels that a continued increase in efficiency can be achieved so that the increase of $382,000 requested for 1965 will not be required.

Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations.—The bill provides $600,000 for this item, the same amount as in the current year and $34,000 less than the budget estimate. The actual requirements for this program cannot be accurately predicted in advance inasmuch as the number of security investigations is dependent on the number of new employees to be hired by international organizations. However, the number is not expected to be substantially different in 1965.

Annuities under special acts.—An appropriation of $1,650,000 is recommended for payment of annuities to widows of former employees of the Lighthouse Service and to employees and survivors of persons employed in the construction of the Panama Canal. This is $50,000 less than the budget estimate and $150,000 less than the current year. The number of annuitants in both programs is declining.

Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund.—The bill contains $10,650,000 for the Government's share of health benefit subscription charges for persons who were enrolled in the program and who have retired since the enactment of the Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. A net increase of 44,900 annuitants with health benefits coverage is expected to be added in 1965 and the amount recommended is $1,150,000 over 1964. For administrative expenses of this program the Committee has approved $1,138,000, which is the same as in 1964 except for added pay act costs.

Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund.—An appropriation of $14,800,000 is included for the Government's share of health insurance for those employees who retired before the comprehensive health benefits program was enacted for Federal employees. The number of annuitants who are participating is estimated at 231,600, or a decline of 4,700 from the previous year. The bill authorizes $348,000 for administrative expenses of the program.

Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.—The Committee recommends $65,000,000 as requested to reimburse the retirement fund for the cost in 1965 of the increase in annuity to retired employees and their survivors provided in Public Law 87–793, approved October 11, 1962. The law requires an annual appropriation to cover such cost. The annuitants will continue to receive

their increased annuities by the appropriation of this amount to reimburse the fund.

Employees life insurance fund.—A limitation of $270,000 is recommended by the Committee for administrative expenses of the Federal employees life insurance program, including the programs assumed from certain employee beneficial associations. This is $7,000 less than the budget estimate and continues the present limitation for another year.

Federal Aviation Agency

The Committee has included $775,249,000 in the bill for all activities of the Federal Aviation Agency. This is $56,601,000 less than the budget estimates; but on the other hand it is $16,907,500 more than the amount appropriated last year, which arises by virtue of programs not in last year's budget.

Appropriations for the Federal Aviation Agency have grown tremendously in recent years. The agency personnel has grown from 24,378 in 1958 to 47,111 last year. Many people think the agency has grown too fast and too large. The Administrator has made outstanding efforts to bring efficiency and economy in his operation. The budget for 1965 shows a reduction of 754 in personnel rather than an increase. The Committee commends the Administrator for this outstanding effort and in order to help him has recommended an additional reduction of 1,500 jobs, which will give him a total of about 44,850 in 1965, of which 41,486 are charged to operations.

Operations.—The Committee recommends $537,600,000 to operate and maintain the national system of air traffic control and related facilities and programs. This is $10,000,000 less than the budget estimate. The $9,600,000 increase the Committee is recommending over the current year is almost entirely for pay act costs.

Facilities and equipment.—The bill includes $50,000,000 for new facilities and equipment. An unobligated balance of $126,248,000 is expected to be on hand June 30, 1964, making a total of approximately $176,000,000 available for expenditure in 1965.

Grants-in-aid for airports.—The bill includes $7,000,000 to liquidate contracts with municipalities for airport construction under authorizations provided in the Federal Airport Act prior to 1961. This provides funding to liquidate all obligations incurred under these prior contract authorizations.

The Committee has also approved $75,000,000 for the 1965 program of airport construction and $75,000,000 for advance funding on the 1966 program as proposed in the budget estimate and as authorized by recent legislation.

Research and development.—The $21,000,000 recommended for research and development related to modernizing the national aviation system is $21,000,000 less than the budget estimate. Substantial sums have been provided for such studies and experimentation in recent years.

Washington National Airport.—The bill includes $3,530,000 for operation and maintenance of this airport and $1,620,000 to replace a general aviation hangar. The amount for operation and maintenance provides for the same level of employment as in 1964. All costs of replacing the hangar will be amortized through rental charges.

Dulles International Airport.—The Committee has approved $4,319,000 to operate Dulles Airport, and $180,000 for construction of access roadways within the airfield. The amount recommended for operating expenses is $300,000 less than the budget estimate. It provides 473 positions, or 14 of the 29 requested over 1964. The construction request is reduced 10 percent, or $20,000.

A general provision carried in the bill last year authorizes the Administrator to give the monies that the general public has been throwing into the fountain in the terminal building to a nonprofit organization to assist needy travelers. About $3,900 has been recovered from the fountain since the airport opened 18 months ago. The provision is made permanent legislation in the bill this year.

Federal Communications Commission

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,310,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission. This is $300,000 less than the budget estimate and $710,000 over last year. Approximately $495,000 of the increase is attributable to increased pay costs. The Committee directs the Commission not to divert any of the employees presently engaged in the processing of applications for licenses in the Bureau of Safety and Special Radio Services until the workload becomes current. The new computer should assist materially in expediting this work, but it may be some time before most of the problems related to the new procedures are solved.

The Committee respectfully suggests to the Commission and the legislative committee that they review the need for an existing requirement that licenses for police, fire and public safety be renewed at least once every five years. It has been brought to the attention of the Committee that no licenses issued to public bodies have yet been revoked, and therefore a renewal of licenses every five years is perhaps unnecessary.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

The Committee has approved $3,670,000 for administrative expenses and $13,120,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Board. Many functions of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation were transferred to the Board during the past year. After making this adjustment, the amount of limitation provided in the bill for administrative expenses is $155,000 less than the budget estimate and gives the agency about one-half the increase it requested. The nonadministrative expenses limitation is $228,000 less than the revised budget estimate. An increase of $15,500 proposed for printing is not allowed and the Committee directs that total expenses for this purpose be maintained at the 1964 level of $25,500.

The bill contains the budget estimate of $225,000 for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. With the adjustment for functions transferred to the Board, it is $20,788 less than in 1964.

Federal Power Commission

The Committee recommends $12,180,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission in 1965. This is $1,155,000 less than the budget estimate and $330,000 more than the amount available in 1964. The increase includes $273,000 for pay act increases and $57,000 for

four additional GS–14 technical advisers, one for the Vice-Chairman and one for each of the three other Commissioners. The Commission's staff has grown 35 percent since 1960. A ceiling of 1,152 jobs is therefore recommended for next year, the same number as in the current year except for the four additional advisers.

Federal Trade Commission

An appropriation of $12,725,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of this Commission, which is $545,000 less than the budget estimate. This provides an increase of $390,000 over the 1964 appropriation for increased pay costs and $120,000 for the full annual cost of 12 additional positions. The limitation contained in the 1964 bill to the effect that no part of the funds provided could be used for an economic questionnaire or economic study of intercorporate relations is carried in the bill again this year.

General Services Administration

The bill contains $537,992,600 for the General Services Administration, which is a reduction of $65,394,800 in the budget estimates and $49,031,800 less than total appropriations for 1964.

Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.—The Committee recommends $213,800,000 for the operation of Government-owned and leased buildings under the management of the General Services Administration. This is a reduction of $10,770,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $2,925,000 over the current year which is primarily for pay act increases.

The cost of this program has increased rapidly in recent years despite the fact the Government is spending over $150,000,000 a year to build new civilian office buildings. This increased operating cost is partly due to agencies obtaining too much leased space for which they pay for part of the first year and then expect GSA to pay the annualized cost the following year. This year the bill includes language prohibiting GSA from financing any new or additional space for any department or agency which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to GSA to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year. The Committee expects the Administrator to restrict the tendency of agencies to expand to larger and more expensive quarters and, with the increasing availability of owned space, to reduce the overall cost of this program.

Repair and improvement of public buildings.—The full budget estimate of $90,000,000 is recommended for repairing and improving Government owned buildings. The Committee considers this to be a prudent investment as it is to take care of what the Government already owns.

Construction, public buildings projects.—The bill contains $151,722,000 for the construction of 149 new buildings, additional amounts for two projects, and acquisition of one project. The amounts recommended have generally been reduced ten percent from the budget estimates and fallout shelters have been eliminated. The Committee urges the Administrator to continue to improve the space-efficiency ratios in new buildings and press for further cost reductions which

will still bring good, functional and efficient structures. A list of the projects being funded in 1965 follows. Prospectuses have been approved by the legislative committees for all of them as required by law.

Public buildings construction projects included in the bill

Location	Sites and expenses (previously funded)	Construction cost	Total
Centre, Alabama	$56,700	$144,800	$201,500
Cullman, Alabama	126,700	417,200	543,900
Vernon, Alabama	54,100	169,900	224,000
Hope, Arkansas	124,500	311,700	436,200
Marshall, Arkansas	95,700	178,100	273,800
McCrory, Arkansas	51,000	91,800	142,800
Mountain Home, Arkansas	96,900	179,800	276,700
Blythe, California	143,000	306,300	449,300
Del Mar, California	220,500	146,000	366,500
Harbor City, California	138,500	152,500	291,000
Jackson, California	153,000	255,600	408,600
Long Beach Harbor Area, California	346,000	2,572,200	2,918,200
Solana Beach, California	122,500	146,000	268,500
Weed, California	84,000	126,700	210,700
West Los Angeles, California	890,000	13,101,300	13,991,300
Glenwood Springs, Colorado	168,600	312,100	480,700
Leadville, Colorado	71,600	176,400	248,000
Windsor Locks, Connecticut	77,600	240,700	318,300
Cross City, Florida	64,000	141,700	205,700
Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park Branch, Florida	61,600	152,800	214,400
Jacksonville, Florida	516,000	6,266,300	6,782,300
Miami, Gratigny Branch, Florida	71,700	204,400	276,100
Ocoee, Florida	61,200	124,300	185,500
Acworth, Georgia	61,500	127,000	188,500
Chatsworth, Georgia	76,200	208,400	284,600
Toccoa, Georgia	125,600	282,600	408,200
Warm Springs, Georgia	38,500	70,200	108,700
Arthur, Illinois	79,100	110,600	189,700
East St. Louis, Illinois	164,600	773,700	938,300
Edwardsville, Illinois	126,900	342,900	469,800
Red Bud, Illinois	69,800	94,600	164,400
Evansville, Indiana (CT FOB)	815,000	1,900,800	2,715,800
Evansville, Indiana (PO FOB)	447,000	1,542,600	1,989,600
Scottsburg, Indiana	63,300	232,900	296,200
Shoals, Indiana	44,200	119,700	163,900
Des Moines, Iowa	1,611,000	7,931,700	9,542,700
Scott City, Kansas	121,300	281,000	402,300
Wellington, Kansas	118,900	259,200	378,100
Clinton, Kentucky	104,400	185,300	289,700
Covington, Kentucky	290,000	3,438,000	3,728,000
Cumberland, Kentucky	45,200	102,200	147,400
Olive Hill, Kentucky	63,200	148,400	211,600
Paris, Kentucky	115,400	218,100	333,500
Richmond, Kentucky	95,200	160,800	256,000
Russell Springs, Kentucky	69,000	86,100	155,100
Baton Rouge, Louisiana	1,315,000	3,393,000	4,708,000
Crowley, Louisiana	133,900	303,500	437,400
Gueydan, Louisiana	46,600	101,600	148,200
Mamou, Louisiana	43,600	72,000	115,600
Mansura, Louisiana	57,500	80,300	137,800
Oberlin, Lousiana	46,900	97,400	144,300
Opelousas, Louisiana	237,000	903,600	1,140,600
Thibodaux, Louisiana	129,900	263,500	393,400
Calais, Maine	60,300	278,200	338,500
Lubec, Maine	65,600	104,500	170,100
Machias, Maine	72,200	220,600	292,800
Centreville, Maryland	108,900	205,000	313,900
North East, Maryland	90,500	114,800	205,300
Prince Frederick, Maryland	82,500	185,900	268,400
Suitland, Maryland	244,000	3,213,000	3,457,000
Boston, Massachusetts	91,000	883,800	974,800
Boston-Lawrence, Massachusetts	815,000	3,748,500	4,563,500
Marlboro, Massachusetts	86,700	242,800	329,500
Milford, Massachusetts	109,700	274,600	384,300
Springfield, Massachusetts	1,000,000	2,704,500	3,704,500
Detroit, Michigan	595,000	2,925,000	3,520,000
Lawton, Michigan	40,600	89,000	129,600

Public buildings construction projects included in the bill —Continued

Location	Sites and expenses (previously funded)	Construction cost	Total
Mancelona, Michigan	$69,800	$94,100	$163,900
Baudette, Minnesota	98,100	159,700	257,800
St. Paul, Minnesota	1,553,000	8,993,300	10,546,300
Bay Springs, Mississippi	52,900	154,800	207,700
Coldwater, Mississippi	35,800	83,500	119,300
Port Gibson, Mississippi	47,800	154,400	202,200
Richton, Mississippi	35,600	80,700	116,300
Branson, Missouri	87,000	142,200	229,200
Crystal City, Missouri	71,300	125,900	197,200
Montgomery City, Missouri	102,300	248,000	350,300
Fullerton, Nebraska	85,200	178,700	263,900
Gothenburg, Nebraska	88,600	147,800	236,400
Carson City, Nevada	563,200	1,889,100	2,452,300
Berlin, New Hampshire	94,000	317,000	411,000
Avenel, New Jersey	57,000	133,200	190,200
Burlington, New Jersey	119,000	261,800	380,800
Newark, New Jersey	1,530,000	12,121,200	13,651,200
Raton, New Mexico	135,400	319,000	454,400
Buffalo, New York	1,409,000	11,034,900	12,443,900
Keeseville, New York	52,700	106,100	158,800
Andrews, North Carolina	40,600	105,100	145,700
Cary, North Carolina	60,100	111,600	171,700
Jacksonville, North Carolina	104,500	274,700	379,200
Kinston, North Carolina	70,800	164,300	235,100
Mars Hill, North Carolina	40,400	101,700	142,100
Raeford, North Carolina	68,000	226,900	294,900
Rich Square, North Carolina	39,200	87,300	126,500
Waynesville, North Carolina	142,200	401,000	543,200
Windsor, North Carolina	57,500	151,100	208,600
Hillsboro, Ohio	82,600	337,300	419,900
Mantua, Ohio	95,300	154,400	249,700
Afton, Oklahoma	67,200	107,300	174,500
Elk City, Oklahoma	120,900	222,400	343,300
Hugo, Oklahoma	130,400	269,500	399,900
Jay, Oklahoma	64,800	174,800	239,600
Baker, Oregon	199,000	1,117,800	1,316,800
Enterprise, Oregon	52,600	195,900	248,500
Prineville, Oregon	112,600	252,300	364,900
Scappoose, Oregon	76,300	125,700	202,000
Berwick, Pennsylvania	119,600	267,800	387,400
Brookville, Pennsylvania	89,600	154,400	244,000
Dallas, Pennsylvania	69,600	151,700	221,300
Duncannon, Pennsylvania	58,800	92,300	151,100
Falls Creek, Pennsylvania	59,300	96,700	156,000
Galeton, Pennsylvania	61,200	119,500	180,700
Hawley, Pennsylvania	84,400	151,700	236,100
Irwin, Pennsylvania	115,400	224,400	339,800
Montrose, Pennsylvania	88,700	151,700	240,400
New Bethlehem, Pennsylvania	69,600	154,400	224,000
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:			
Cedarhurst Branch	146,900	182,300	329,200
Green Tree Branch	146,900	182,300	329,200
Pleasant Hills Branch	140,900	182,300	323,200
Youngsville, Pennsylvania	66,100	96,700	162,800
Humacao, Puerto Rico	91,000	181,300	272,300
Providence, Rhode Island	86,400	235,300	321,700
Elloree, South Carolina	36,200	87,400	123,600
Ridgeland, South Carolina	63,600	246,500	310,100
Williston, South Carolina	44,800	91,800	136,600
Oneida, Tennessee	51,800	131,800	183,600
Buffalo, Texas	58,500	86,000	144,500
Carthage, Texas	112,200	235,600	347,800
Fairfield, Texas	64,200	168,700	232,900
Gonzales, Texas	116,100	224,000	340,100
Naples, Texas	66,700	104,100	170,800
Sulphur Springs, Texas	131,100	279,500	410,600
Heber, Utah	98,300	161,300	259,600
Provo, Utah	58,000	378,000	436,000
St. Johnsbury, Vermont	109,800	335,000	444,800
Franconia, Virginia		5,800,000	5,800,000
Cle Elum, Washington	68,300	120,200	188,500
Colville, Washington	44,400	393,200	437,600
Newport, Washington	82,600	136,700	219,300
Spokane, Washington	1,482,000	6,385,500	7,867,500
Vancouver, Washington	243,700	426,500	670,200
Gassaway, West Virginia	75,000	115,200	190,200
Glenville, West Virginia	76,500	159,300	235,800
Parsons, West Virginia	89,200	171,200	260,400
Pineville, West Virginia	77,500	157,500	235,000

Public buildings construction projects included in the bill—Continued

Location	Sites and expenses (previously funded)	Construction cost	Total
Summersville, West Virginia	$85,000	$232,200	$317,200
White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia	92,300	129,300	221,600
Eagle River, Wisconsin	109,200	152,700	261,900
Elroy, Wisconsin	38,300	113,400	151,700
Horicon, Wisconsin	85,500	120,800	206,300
HHFA Building, Washington, D.C	3,000,000	26,027,100	29,027,100
Small Projects Outside the District of Columbia		500,000	500,000
Adjustments in previously funded projects		−840,300	−840,300
Total	30,081,000	151,722,000	181,803,000

Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.—The Committee is not recommending any funds for sites and planning. The Committee bases its recommendation on the fact that (1) the legislative committees under law must approve prospectuses for sites and planning and construction money for projects costing over $100,000; and (2) as the matter stands today the budget estimates for construction have not been sufficiently large to keep the construction program current. The construction program is lagging two or three years behind funding for sites and planning, which is bad in the judgment of the Committee. By not recommending any more money at this time the Committee is trying to keep both programs in more equal balance.

Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.—The Committee has approved the revised budget estimate of $9,885,000 for prepayment of 12 lease-purchase contracts and payment of principal, interest and taxes on the 6 remaining projects built under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954. The Committee has previously urged the Administrator to purchase these buildings as the opportunity arises as it saves the Government money.

Expenses, U.S. court facilities.—The bill includes $1,030,600 for space and furnishings for United States Courts. This is the same amount as the 1964 appropriation and $433,400 less than the budget estimate.

Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.—The Committee has included in the bill $48,920,000 for the personal property management activities of the General Services Administration including the operation of a worldwide supply system. The amount recommended is a reduction of $5,165,000 in the revised budget estimate and an increase of $2,920,000 over the amount appropriated for 1964. The increase is primarily for pay act costs and the additional supply functions transferred from the Department of Defense. Appropriations for supply activities have increased greatly in recent years and the Committee is of the opinion that increased efficiency and greater economies can be achieved commensurate with the increased volume. Stores stock sales are estimated to increase from $310,000,000 in 1964 to $375,000,000 in 1965. Total Federal supply system volume is expected to reach $1,578,000,000 next year.

Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service.—The bill includes $9,512,500 for the utilization and disposal functions of GSA with respect to excess and surplus real and personal property. The amount recommended is a reduction of $539,500 in the revised budget

estimate and the same as 1964 except for the pay act increase. All costs are financed from proceeds of sales.

Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.—The Committee recommends $14,955,000 to operate the Government's central archives and records system. This amount is $455,000 less than the revised budget estimate. It continues the funding level of 1964 with added pay costs.

The Committee recommends language in the bill which will continue allowances and expenses for Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy through all of fiscal year 1965. A special act was passed last session authorizing an expenditure of $50,000 for that purpose, to end December 11, 1964. The Committee is advised that Mrs. Kennedy is receiving about 700 letters a day and an additional $25,000 is required for assistance in this regard for the period ending June 30, 1965.

Operating expenses, Transportation and Communication Service.—The bill contains $5,465,000 for transportation and communications activities of the General Services Administration. An increase of $615,000 over 1964 is provided for expanding the recently created Federal Telecommunications System and for pay act increases. The system will eventually connect 8,000 Government offices in 1,750 cities and towns. The amount provided is $535,000 less than the budget estimate.

Strategic and critical materials.—The Committee has approved $17,755,000 for maintaining the National stockpile of strategic and critical materials. This is $335,000 less than the budget estimate and $6,170,000 less than 1964. All costs are financed from proceeds of sales.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.—The bill contains $1,505,000 for the Administrator's office and other activities financed through this item. This includes a $67,000 increase over 1964 to cover the cost of pay act increases and the full cost requested for his immediate office, but the additions proposed for legislative, information, and business services are denied.

Expenses, Presidential transition.—The bill includes $400,000 for carrying out the provisions of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963, approved March 7, 1964. The amount recommended is $400,000 less than the budget estimate.

Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.—The Committee has approved the $310,000 requested for allowances and office facilities for three former Presidents and the widow of one former President.

Administrative operations fund.—A limitation of $19,565,000 is recommended for administrative, financial, legal, automatic data processing, and other general supporting services for GSA programs. The amount included in the bill is $2,275,000 less than the budget estimate.

Working capital fund.—The Committee is not recommending the $200,000 requested for additional capital investment in printing and reproduction equipment.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator.—The bill contains $15,525,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator.

This is $1,390,000 less than the budget estimate. This item includes funds for administrative costs for general agency supervision, consolidated compliance activities, the voluntary home mortgage credit program, public works planning advances and urban renewal programs. The number of employees in programs financed with this appropriation has increased substantially year by year. The employment level of 1,085 in 1960 has risen to 1,512 at the present time, or an increase of approximately 40 percent. The Committee recommends retaining the present level of funding for 1965.

Urban planning grants.—The bill contains $2,350,000 for matching grants to State, metropolitan or regional planning agencies to help finance surveys and urban renewal plans in small cities or metropolitan regional areas under Sec. 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended. This is $22,650,000 less than the budget estimate and exhausts present legislative authorization for appropriations for this purpose.

Urban studies and housing research.—The $387,400 recommended for research and studies in critical areas of housing continues the same level of appropriation as in fiscal year 1964 instead of $1,500,000 as proposed in the budget estimate.

Administrative expenses, mass transportation demonstrations.—The bill includes $100,000 for administrative expenses related to mass transportation demonstration projects. A number of projects are under contract at the present time and legislation is pending to extend and expand the program. The amount recommended is one-half the budget request.

Open-space land grants.—The Committee has approved $15,000,000 for grants to States and local public bodies to assist in acquiring land in urban areas for park, recreation and other similar purposes. This continues the program level of the last two years and substantially exhausts the present authorization for appropriations.

Low-income housing demonstration grants.—The $5,075,000 requested is not included in the bill inasmuch as legislative authorization is required to continue the program.

Public works planning fund.—The Committee considered budget estimates of $16,000,000 to increase the capital in this revolving fund, including $4,000,000 as a 1964 supplemental item and $12,000,000 in the budget for 1965. The bill includes $4,000,000 to replace amounts not required to be repaid under the Public Works Acceleration Act and bring the total capital to the $58,000,000 presently authorized by law.

Urban renewal fund.—This item provides funds to liquidate capital grant contracts on urban renewal projects. The contract authorization for this program at the present time is $4,000,000,000 and a request is pending to increase this by $1,400,000,000. Appropriations to liquidate the awards are not requested until projects are completed and final settlement is to be made. A total of $1,064,500,000 has been appropriated to date to liquidate such contracts. The bill provides an additional $200,000,000 in 1965 which is double the appropriation made in 1964 and $65,000,000 less than the budget estimate. This amount is expected to be adequate for program disbursement requirements in 1965.

Housing for the elderly fund.—The Committee has approved $25,000,000 to increase the capital in the revolving fund for direct

loans for housing for the elderly to $275,000,000, the present ceiling on authorizations for appropriations. The Committee also recommends $915,000 for administrative expenses which will provide for 100 positions instead of 120 as proposed in the budget estimate.

College housing loans.—A limitation of $1,900,000 is recommended for administrative expenses of the college housing loan program as proposed in the budget estimate. This provides for 186 positions, or 5 less than in 1964.

Public facility loans.—The bill includes $1,220,000 for administrative expenses in connection with the program of loans for construction of public works projects. This is the same amount as in 1964 and is $80,000 less than the budget request.

Revolving fund (liquidating programs).—A limitation of $110,000 is included for administrative expenses of programs financed through this revolving fund. The Government investment in housing and other programs liquidated through this fund at one time was $2,500,000,000. The value of remaining assets on June 30, 1963, had been reduced to about $21,000,000. The limitation provides for 9 positions to service assets of programs previously liquidated through this fund.

Federal National Mortgage Association.—The Committee recommends $8,500,000 as a limitation for administrative expenses of the Association. This is $250,000 less than the present authorization and $300,000 under the budget estimate. The workload is relatively stable at the present time. Expenses in the current year are running less than expected and only about $8,400,000 will be used in 1964. The amount recommended in the bill is $100,000 over the current expenditure rate due to increased pay act costs.

Federal Housing Administration.—The Committee recommends limitations of $9,000,000 for administrative and $75,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses related to processing workloads of mortgage insurance applications, or a total of $84,000,000 for all operating expenses of FHA. The Committee notes that expenses and jobs have been increasing rapidly in recent years and is therefore recommending $6,125,000 less than the budget estimate for 1965. The Committee hopes that the Commissioner will make good use of all his personnel, particularly in the 81 field offices. When the workload slackens in one area some of the employees can be transferred to another area to get the workload on a current basis. In order to facilitate further, the Committee recommends the use of fee appraisers consistent with good judgment. There is no limitation placed on the number or amount of such fee appraisals.

Public Housing Administration.—The bill provides $200,000,000 for payment of annual contributions to local public housing authorities. This is a $3,000,000 increase over 1964 for the 563,563 units in 3,691 projects that are expected to be on Federal subsidy on June 30, 1965, requiring annual contributions payments. The amount recommended is a reduction of $14,000,000 in the budget estimate.

An appropriation of $15,484,000 is included in the bill for administrative expenses of the public housing program. This provides the same amount as in 1964, which is $1,186,000 less than the budget estimate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

An appropriation of $25,260,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of this Commission in 1965. This is $590,000 less than the amount requested and an increase of $590,000 over the current appropriation, due primarily to the added cost of pay act increases.

During the hearings the Committee received testimony from representatives of the railroad and trucking industries requesting additional personnel in motor carrier enforcement work. The Committee is glad to see the railroads and trucking interests together on one item. The Commission presently has 422 employees engaged in activities of motor carrier field service and 49 in the Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance. More activities in this regard should be brought about by closer cooperation between the Federal and State highway patrols. The State is responsible for the conduct on its highways. Each State has its own highway patrols and closer cooperation between the two could achieve the results desired by the railroad and trucking interests.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

The Committee considered budget estimates totaling $5,445,000,000 for the space program, including $141,000,000 for a supplemental item and $5,304,000,000 in the 1965 budget estimates. Total appropriations of $5,200,000,000 are recommended for NASA in the bill. These amounts reflect reductions of $245,000,000 in the total budget estimates considered.

Research and development.—The budget estimate of $4,382,000,000 contained in the 1965 research and development budget contemplated approval of a supplemental request of $141,000,000 within the authorization provided by Public Law 88–113, approved September 6, 1963. The Committee is recommending $4,345,000,000. This is a reduction of $178,000,000 in the combined requests. Funds appropriated under this heading are used almost entirely to finance contracts with industry.

Construction of facilities.—The bill includes $245,000,000 for the construction of additional facilities at the various NASA installations. The amount recommended in the bill is $435,000,000 less than last year and $36,000,000 below the budget estimate.

Administrative operations.—The Agency requested $641,000,000 for administrative expenses and operating costs of its research centers. The Committee recommends $610,000,000, which is $31,000,000 less than the budget estimate, but which is still larger than last year because there is $38,000,000 in this year's budget for pay that was not in the budget in 1964. In addition, there is $73,700,000 in the 1965 estimates to purchase computers against leasing such equipment. This figure of $610,000,000 provides about the same number of jobs as in 1964.

National Capital Housing Authority

The Committee has approved the budget estimate of $37,000 to maintain and operate 73 units in the housing program provided under Title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act. This appropriation finances only a small part of the public housing program

of the District of Columbia, but it gives the Congress an opportunity to review the entire program in the Nation's Capital annually.

National Science Foundation

Appropriation of $420,400,000 is recommended for the Foundation in 1965. This is $67,220,000 less than the budget estimate and $67,200,000 more than the amount provided in 1964. The Committee has specifically approved the $25,000,000 requested for developing centers of excellence in science and engineering. This program was initiated by the Foundation in 1964 and promises to be one of the best methods to truly broaden the development of scientific and engineering knowledge in every part of the Nation, particularly in those areas where assistance is needed most.

Renegotiation Board

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $2,600,000 for the Board, which is $50,000 more than the appropriation for 1964. The entire increase is for pay increase costs. It will continue the present level of staffing of 225 for another year.

Securities and Exchange Commission

The Committee has approved $14,680,000 for salaries and expenses of this Commission. The recommended increase of $742,500 over the appropriation for the current year allows $642,500, or one-half the increase requested for pay act and other costs, and $100,000 as proposed in a budget amendment to provide Civil Service retirement coverage for 224 attorneys who are presently without such coverage due to a technicality in the law. The Civil Service Commission has assured the Committee these employees will not receive a free ride but will pay into the fund their full share if they wish credit for service prior to July 1, 1964.

In recent years, this Commission has received substantial increases to strengthen its enforcement activities. Chairman Cary and his staff have done an outstanding job. The Chairman is certainly one of the most conscientious and able men heading a regulatory commission to appear before the Committee for a number of years. During his tenure a thorough review of the effectiveness of securities laws has been undertaken. This has required an increase in staff and the number has grown from 1,000 in 1960 to 1,468 at the present time. The review work is now essentially complete and the Committee believes the number of jobs should start declining after next year by at least 25 positions.

Selective Service System

The bill provides $39,440,000 to operate the Selective Service System in 1965. This is an increase of $1,500,000 over the regular 1964 appropriation, not including a 1964 supplemental item to cover the cost of an unexpected number of inductions. The increase recommended is to handle a greater volume of registrations in 1965. The Committee again cautions the agency to give primary attention to the needs of the local boards.

Veterans Administration

The Committee recommends a total of $5,423,978,000 for the Veterans Administration. This is an increase of $39,194,000 over the amount of appropriations to date for 1964, and is $17,963,000 less than the budget estimates.

General operating expenses.—The bill includes $155,000,000 for operating expenses of the entire Veterans Administration with the exception of the medical program. This is $524,000 less than the amount requested. The Committee in the past, as it does now, thinks the VA will make great economies next year and in the years to come through the use of automated equipment.

Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.—An appropriation of $14,200,000 is recommended for medical administration, management of construction programs, and medical education and training. This reflects a reduction of $685,000, or about 50 jobs, in the budget estimate for the area medical offices. The Committee requests that the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director review the need for area medical offices to see if they can be abolished. It appears that they are a surplus layer of administration in the medical program and that the effectiveness of hospital management would be substantially improved if they were eliminated entirely.

Medical and prosthetic research.—The $36,000,000 recommended in the bill for medical and prosthetic research is $2,258,000 more than was appropriated for this purpose in 1964. The amounts available for such research have increased rapidly in recent years and the amount recommended in the bill for 1965 is therefore reduced $987,000 from the budget estimate.

Medical care.—The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $1,115,935,000 for the operation of 168 hospitals and 20 domiciliary facilities in the Veterans Administration medical program in 1965. This is an increase of $34,749,000 over the 1964 appropriation. Approximately one-half the increase provides for the added cost of pay act increases and the balance is for other adjustments and improvements in the program.

Compensation and pensions.—The Committee is recommending the budget estimate of $3,963,000,000 for this item. This includes $2,121,488,000 for compensation payments to 2,354,185 beneficiaries, $1,778,160,000 for pensions to 2,106,275 recipients, and $63,352,000 for certain other benefits and allowances payable pursuant to law.

Readjustment benefits.—The bill contains $34,600,000 for education and training and other readjustment benefit programs budgeted under this item. This is $32,400,000 less than the current year. Benefits for veterans under most programs of education and training have expired and the Korean program ends January 31, 1965. This account has declined steadily in recent years.

Veterans insurance and indemnities.—The Committee has allowed $13,700,000 for payment of claims under insurance programs as proposed in the budget estimate. The amount requested is $16,500,000 less than last year.

Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.—The Committee recommends $91,233,000 for funding on 9 hospital replacement projects, 14 modernizations, and other miscellaneous construction improvements to hospitals. There are no contractor estimates on these

projects as many of them are still in the planning stage. In recommending a reduction of 10 percent in the overall cost, the Committee urges the Administrator to determine that good, substantial and useful buildings without frills and unessential features are provided. The $630,000 requested for incorporating fallout shelters in some of the projects is not allowed.

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.—The Committee has approved the budget estimate of $310,000 for treatment of eligible Philippine veterans. This continues the same amount of appropriation as in 1964.

Loan guaranty revolving fund.—Instead of providing authorization for this fund on a permanent and indefinite basis as proposed in the budget estimate, the Committee has again included language in the bill authorizing the budgeted amount of $257,000,000 to finance costs, other than administrative expenses, for the loan guaranty program.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 15, in connection with the Federal Aviation Agency:

Money hereafter recovered from the pool and fountain at Dulles International Airport shall not be subject to the Act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484m, 485a), and may be given to a nonprofit organization which, in the determination of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, promotes and provides for the welfare of travelers in air commerce.

On page 18, in connection with the General Services Administration:

: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation may be used to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year.

On page 32, in connection with the General Services Administration:

: Provided further, That the amount of $840,300 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1961 and 1962, for projects at Vanceboro, Maine, Pembina, North Dakota, and Wyandotte, Michigan, is hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation, and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the Post Office and Federal office building at Augusta, Maine, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, is hereby increased by $460,000.

On page 34, in connection with the General Services Administration:

, including $25,000 which shall be available for continuing to carry out the purposes of Sec. 2 of Public Law 88–195 approved December 11, 1963, for the period ending June 30, 1965.

On page 47, in connection with the National Science Foundation:

; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses

On page 53, in connection with the Veterans Administration:

: Provided, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Texas, is reduced from "$2,000,000" to "$1,990,000".

SEPARATE VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN LOUIS C. WYMAN

NASA Appropriations

In terms of priorities in spending—of deciding on what we shall spend of available dollars to spend—I am convinced that we are spending too much money on our civilian space programs. As I view it, without harm to any legitimate interest and concern of the United States and with benefit to the economy by contributing to fiscal stability by achieving a more reasonable flow of federal funds, the present space appropriation can and should be reduced by at least a billion dollars. I am convinced that such a reduction would neither wreck the program nor interfere with the proper security interests of the United States.

Two things are seriously wrong in our space spending: First, the 1970 target date for a man on the moon; and Second, advance contracting for Apollo before we know that Gemini is going to work.

1970 TARGET

One thing is certain amidst all the uncertainties of our space effort. This is that the 1970 target date (to put a man on the moon) is foolish. It is like setting up a straw man but not knowing whether he is straw or steel. If he's steel, we're not going to be able to knock him down, and we will lose more face. If he's straw, nothing has been accomplished except the wasting of tremendous additional billions of taxpayers' dollars by being in a hurry in a field where apparently nobody else is in a hurry, even the Communists, at least to get to the moon. Our target date in terms of American space policy should be simply that we will go to the moon if, as and when our space technology and our pocketbook find it possible to do so, not by any set date.

APOLLO LEAD-TIME

A fact of great significance is that the entire Apollo program is contingent on the success of Gemini—on the establishment of a clearly defined rendezvous capability in space. Despite this fact, billions of dollars in the space program are being committed to long-lead-time advance contracting for Apollo launch and space capsules and modules (including the so-called lunar excursion module) that we may never be able to use at all if Gemini doesn't work. If this is sought to be justified because of the so-called 1970 target date, it is inexcusable. It is waste, pure and simple, and the people of this Country who are paying these tremendous sums ought to be informed of these facts. There is no need to risk these billion dollar losses.

We should defer the long-lead-time contracting in Apollo until after Gemini is proven and the feasibility of the lunar orbit approach

system is proven. If anyone has any doubt but that there are substantial non-sequiturs in the assumptions concerning presently projected sequence of steps to a manned lunar landing, they should read Dr. Hugh Dryden's "Footprints on the Moon" in the March, 1964 issue of the National Geographic Magazine.

WHY MEN RATHER THAN INSTRUMENTS?

As NASA justifications are presented to the Committee, one is compelled to return again and again to the question of why a man on the moon. Why would not instruments do just as well and at vastly less cost?

We have not been able even to make a soft-landing of instruments on the moon as yet. Projecting a manned landing with the costly emphasis of American concern for human safety in the process costs now and will require in the future billions upon billions of extra, sorely-needed tax dollars, largely for prestige. There isn't much else in the near vacuum that prevails on the moon, with heat and temperature ranges approaching a 500-degree variation. No air to breathe, no water to drink—a strange objective indeed.

The moon is no place for man to be. It is a hostile environment to human life. This we know now. It is not a matter of speculation. The moonshot glamour is no voyage of Christopher Columbus. We can see and even photograph the lunar surface. Isabella could only imagine what lay beyond the horizon at sea.

To allow a human being to exist for a single second in the lunar atmosphere requires costly pressurized space suits. Even for the Gemini preliminary tests, these suits cost $60,000 each. One can only hazard a guess as to the cost of a space suit for a man on the moon to be able to survive even a matter of hours. To this must be added the millions upon millions in costs for all the tests and preparations to develop what is believed may be a workable suit for a few steps on the surface of the moon. I do not believe this cost is worth the loss to Americans of other demonstrable societal benefits that we are denied because of the fantastic drain of federal funds in extra billions in a space program targeted at civilian scientific exploration of the moon with the follow on of Mars and Venus.

WHAT ARE OUR REAL OBJECTIVES IN SPACE?

It is fair to ask once again, what are our real objectives in space? The only justification for such vast expenditures of money at a time when we are heading toward national insolvency would be something in the nature of a National Security Council advisory that, should Communists get to the moon before we do they might use it as a means to force us to capitulate by way of some futuristic application of laser beam or other as yet unknown means of hemispheric destruction. There is no such testimony, nor does NASA under existing law even have a permissible military objective, such as integration of weapons systems in capsule mock-ups. So, aside from showing we can accom-

plish something we set out to do for so-called "prestige", when all these billions have been spent the lunar-landing program, even if successful, will have accomplished for those presently living very little, if anything, except to deny all of us a great deal of alleviation of misery in life on earth as well as saddling our children with an even greater mortgage on their future ability to continue life under the free enterprise system.

MILITARY ROLE IN SPACE

Maneuverable capsules in inner space, with military capabilities of observation and intercept, are an obvious necessity with responsible indication that the Communist space program is oriented toward just such a capability. We will look foolish with our two- and three-stage boosters behind a scientific junket should Communists continue their march toward world supremacy by having devised some new method of space warfare.

With space funds limited as they are, it is vital that we do not spend ourselves broke and overextended in *civilian, scientific* space programs. The emphasis should be upon military necessities in space—with the civilian space program complementary thereto.

In my opinion, the justifications for spending in space programs that have been submitted to the Appropriations Committee have failed to establish any pressing need or justification for the Apollo program in the manner in which it is being programmed.

CUMULATIVE COSTS

The hard economic facts of space costs to date are that we have appropriated nearly 12 billion dollars in our space efforts. The current requests amount to $5.445 billions more, and the over-all program designed to yield a single landing on the moon, with considerable fallout to gigantic booster capabilities and other interplanetary and lunar observations, will cost in the admitted vicinity of at least $34 billions. Thus, with the appropriation in the current bill of $5.2 billion, we are but half-way in the single, most expensive civilian program ever undertaken by the United States and which is being continued under pressure of haste although our governmental debt is astronomical and our government is allowed to be operated at a loss of billions more each year.

Single launches for the Saturn I test shot cost $50 million each. The projections for the Saturn V monster launches are $100 million each, with some 15 programmed. Even if successful, unless related to a prime security concern of this Nation, what is proved except that we can do it? Man in space faces greater hazards to existence than he would 5,000 feet under water. Except as may be necessary to preserve or protect our survival on earth, it is difficult to justify billions for such ventures. There is vastly greater reason for oceanographic exploration than for junkets to the moon.

CONCLUSION

It is fair to ask, why the hurry? Why the extra billions for a manned moon landing? Why the tremendous commitments to lunar excursion modules and orbital space vehicles before the capability to rendezvous has been proven? The whole cost of Gemini is less than the single year's cost for this increment of Apollo.

We should slow down in our spending on space, reassess the situation and bring the programs back to a more realistic, down-to-earth basis. The United States Treasury is not a bottomless pit, but some of the space advocates seem to think it is. We should cut back the present space appropriation by at least a billion dollars, or to an appropriation for Fiscal 1965 of $4.2 billions. This is not going to wreck anything except the best-laid plans of a few space contractors. But it will help a great deal in providing additional funds for some of the pressingly important things we must do now on earth.

LOUIS C. WYMAN, M.C.

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Appropriation estimates, 1964	Appropriation estimates, 1965	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	$89,000	$89,000	
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property	1,200,000	1,200,000	
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations	1,289,000	1,289,000	

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January, 1964, budget document for 1965. Subject to further revision.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965	Recommended in bill for 1965	Bill compared with—	
				1964 appropriations	1965 estimates
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:					
Administrative expenses	*($2,430,000)*	[1] *($3,825,000)*	*($3,670,000)*	*(+$1,240,000)*	*(−$155,000)*
Nonadministrative expenses	*(12,800,000)*	[2] *(13,408,000)*	*(13,120,000)*	*(+320,000)*	*(−288,000)*
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	*(1,315,000)*	*(225,000)*	*(225,000)*	*(−1,090,000)*	
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
College housing loans	*(1,903,000)*	*(1,900,000)*	*(1,900,000)*	*(−3,000)*	
Public facility loans	*(1,220,000)*	*(1,300,000)*	*(1,220,000)*		*(−80,000)*

Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(135, 000)	(110, 000)	(110, 000)	(−25, 000)	
Housing for the elderly	(885, 000)	(1, 150, 000)	(915, 000)	(+30, 000)	(−235, 000)
Federal National Mortgage Association	(8, 750, 000)	(8, 800, 000)	(8, 500, 000)	(−250, 000)	(−300, 000)
Federal Housing Administration:					
Administrative expenses	(9, 500, 000)	(10, 375, 000)	(9, 000, 000)	(−500, 000)	(−1, 375, 000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(76, 565, 000)	(79, 750, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(−1, 565, 000)	(−4, 750, 000)
Public Housing Administration:					
Administrative expenses	(15, 484, 000)	(16, 670, 000)	(15, 484, 000)		(−1, 186, 000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(1, 420, 000)	(1, 605, 000)	(1, 420, 000)		(−185, 000)
Total, administrative expenses	(132, 407, 000)	(139, 118, 000)	(130, 564, 000)	(−1, 843, 000)	(−8, 554, 000)

[1] Reflects reduction of $65,000 in H. Doc. 240.

[2] Reflects reduction of $35,000 in H. Doc. 240.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1964 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1965

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (including 1964 supplementals)
TITLE I					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL					
Salaries and expenses	$525,000	$525,000	$500,000	−$25,000	−$25,000
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING					
Salaries and expenses	4,695,000	5,700,000	4,285,000	−410,000	−1,415,000
State and local preparedness	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	----------	----------
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies	4,190,000	6,500,000	4,190,000	----------	−2,310,000
Total, Office of Emergency Planning	10,385,000	13,700,000	9,975,000	−410,000	−3,725,000
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
Salaries and expenses	880,000	950,000	880,000	----------	−70,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	11,790,000	15,175,000	11,355,000	−435,000	−3,820,000

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Disaster relief	[1] 70, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	−50, 000, 000	----------
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Civil Defense					
Operation and maintenance	70, 319, 000	92, 400, 000	70, 000, 000	−319, 000	−22, 400, 000
Research, shelter survey and marking	41, 250, 000	----------	19, 200, 000	−22, 050, 000	+19, 200, 000
Shelter, construction, and research and development	----------	265, 600, 000	----------	----------	−265, 600, 000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense	111, 569, 000	358, 000, 000	89, 200, 000	−22, 369, 000	−268, 800, 000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Public Health Service					
Emergency health activities	27, 500, 000	9, 539, 000	8, 500, 000	−19, 000, 000	−1, 039, 000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
Civil Aeronautics Board					
Salaries and expenses	10, 240, 000	[2] 10, 775, 000	10, 440, 000	+200, 000	−335, 000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization)	79, 000, 000	82, 824, 000	79, 000, 000	----------	−3, 824, 000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	89, 240, 000	93, 599, 000	89, 440, 000	+200, 000	−4, 159, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 35.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropri tions, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (including 1964 supplementals)
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$21, 805, 000	$22, 187, 000	$21, 805, 000	----------	−$382, 000
Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations	600, 000	634, 000	600, 000	----------	−34, 000
Annuities under special acts	1, 800, 000	1, 700, 000	1, 650, 000	−$150, 000	−50, 000
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund	9, 500, 000	10, 664, 000	10, 650, 000	+1, 150, 000	−14, 000
Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund	14, 800, 000	14, 840, 000	14, 800, 000	----------	−40, 000
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund	62, 000, 000	65, 000, 000	65, 000, 000	+3, 000, 000	----------
Administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund (limitation)	*(270, 000)*	*(277, 000)*	*(270, 000)*	----------	*(−7, 000)*
Total Civil Service Commission	110, 505, 000	115, 025, 000	114, 505, 000	+4, 000, 000	−520, 000

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY					
Operations	528, 000, 000	[3] 547, 600, 000	537, 600, 000	+9, 600, 000	−10, 000, 000
Facilities and equipment	100, 250, 000	75, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	−50, 250, 000	−25, 000, 000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)	20, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	−13, 000, 000	----------
Grants-in-aid for airports, 1965	----------	[4] 75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	+75, 000, 000	----------
Grants-in-aid for airports, 1966	----------	[4] 75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	+75, 000, 000	----------
Research and development	40, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	21, 000, 000	−19, 000, 000	−21, 000, 000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	3, 581, 500	3, 631, 000	3, 530, 000	−51, 500	−101, 000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	3, 985, 000	4, 619, 000	4, 319, 000	+334, 000	−300, 000
Construction, Washington National Airport	2, 075, 000	1, 800, 000	1, 620, 000	−455, 000	−180, 000
Construction, Dulles International Airport	450, 000	200, 000	180, 000	−270, 000	−20, 000
Civil supersonic aircraft development	60, 000, 000	----------	----------	−60, 000, 000	----------
Total, Federal Aviation Agency	758, 341, 500	831, 850, 000	775, 249, 000	+16, 907, 500	−56, 601, 000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	15, 600, 000	16, 610, 000	16, 310, 000	+710, 000	−300, 000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	11, 850, 000	13, 335, 000	12, 180, 000	+330, 000	−1, 155, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 35.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (including 1964 supplementals)
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$12,214,750	$13,270,000	$12,725,000	+$510,250	−$545,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	210,875,000	[5] 224,570,000	213,800,000	+2,925,000	−10,770,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings	75,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	+15,000,000	----------
Construction, public buildings projects	157,600,800	169,613,400	151,722,000	−5,878,800	−17,891,400
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	40,000,000	29,500,000	----------	−40,000,000	−29,500,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	5,200,000	[6] 9,885,000	9,885,000	+4,685,000	----------
Expenses, United States court facilities	1,030,600	1,464,000	1,030,600	----------	−433,400
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	46,000,000	[7] 54,085,000	48,920,000	+2,920,000	−5,165,000
General supply fund	30,000,000	----------	----------	−30,000,000	----------
Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	*(9,387,500)*	[8] *(10,052,000)*	*(9,512,500)*	*(+125,000)*	*(−539,500)*
perating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	14,730,000	[9] 15,410,000	14,955,000	+225,000	−455,000

Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	4, 850, 000	6, 000, 000	5, 465, 000	+615, 000	−535, 000
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	*(23, 925, 000)*	[10] *(18, 090, 000)*	*(17, 755, 000)*	*(−6, 170, 000)*	*(−335, 000)*
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1, 438, 000	1, 550, 000	1, 505, 000	+67, 000	−45, 000
Expenses, Presidential transition	----------	[11] 800, 000	400, 000	+400, 000	−400, 000
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	300, 000	310, 000	310, 000	+10, 000	----------
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	*(18, 150, 000)*	*(21, 840, 000)*	*(19, 565, 000)*	*(+1, 415, 000)*	*(−2, 275, 000)*
Working capital fund	----------	200, 000	----------	----------	−200, 000
Total, General Services Administration	587, 024, 400	603, 387, 400	537, 992, 600	−49, 031, 800	−65, 394, 800
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY					
Office of the Administrator:					
Salaries and expenses	15, 525, 000	16, 915, 000	15, 525, 000	----------	−1, 390, 000
Urban planning grants	21, 150, 000	25, 000, 000	2, 350, 000	−18, 800, 000	−22, 650, 000
Urban studies and housing research	387, 400	1, 500, 000	387, 400	----------	−1, 112, 600
Mass transportation demonstration grants	5, 000, 000	----------	----------	−5, 000, 000	----------
Administrative expenses, mass transportation demonstrations	*(195, 000)*	200, 000	100, 000	+100, 000	−100, 000
Open-space land grants	15, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	----------	−15, 000, 000
Low-income housing demonstration programs	1, 200, 000	5, 075, 000	----------	−1, 200, 000	−5, 075, 000
Public works planning fund	2, 000, 000	[12] 16, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	+2, 000, 000	−12, 000, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 35.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (including 1964 supplementals)
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—Con.					
Office of the Administrator—Continued					
Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization)	$100, 000, 000	$265, 000, 000	$200, 000, 000	+$100, 000, 000	−$65, 000, 000
Housing for the elderly fund	100, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	−75, 000, 000	−50, 000, 000
Total, Office of the Administrator	260, 262, 400	434, 690, 000	262, 362, 400	+2, 100, 000	−172, 327, 600
Public Housing Administration:					
Annual contributions	197, 000, 000	214, 000, 000	200, 000, 000	+3, 000, 000	−14, 000, 000
Administrative expenses	15, 484, 000	16, 670, 000	15, 484, 000		−1, 186, 000
Total, Public Housing Administration	212, 484, 000	230, 670, 000	215, 484, 000	+3, 000, 000	−15, 186, 000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	472, 746, 400	665, 360, 000	477, 846, 400	+5, 100, 000	−187, 513, 600

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	24, 670, 000	25, 850, 000	25, 260, 000	+590, 000	−590, 000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION					
Research and development	3, 926, 000, 000	[13] 4,523,000,000	4, 345, 000, 000	+419, 000, 000	−178, 000, 000
Construction of facilities	680, 000, 000	281, 000, 000	245, 000, 000	−435, 000, 000	−36, 000, 000
Administrative operations	494, 000, 000	641, 000, 000	610, 000, 000	+116, 000, 000	−31, 000, 000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5, 100, 000, 000	5, 445, 000, 000	5, 200, 000, 000	+100, 000, 000	−245, 000, 000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
Operation and maintenance of properties	43, 000	37, 000	37, 000	−6, 000	----------
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses	353, 200, 000	[14] 487, 620, 000	420, 400, 000	+67, 200, 000	−67, 220, 000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	2, 550, 000	2, 600, 000	2, 600, 000	+50, 000	----------
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	13, 937, 500	[15] 15, 325, 000	14, 680, 000	+742, 500	−645, 000

See foo tnotes at end of table, p. 35.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (including 1964 supplementals)
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses	$37, 940, 000	$43, 020, 000	$39, 440, 000	+$1, 500, 000	−$3, 580, 000
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION					
General operating expenses	159, 750, 000	[16] 155, 524, 000	155, 000, 000	−4, 750, 000	−524, 000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	14, 800, 000	[17] 14, 885, 000	14, 200, 000	−600, 000	−685, 000
Medical and prosthetic research	33, 742, 000	36, 987, 000	36, 000, 000	+2, 258, 000	−987, 000
Medical care	1, 081, 186, 000	1, 115, 935, 000	1, 115, 935, 000	+34, 749, 000	
Compensation and pensions	3, 921, 000, 000	3, 963, 000, 000	3, 963, 000, 000	+42, 000, 000	
Readjustment benefits	67, 000, 000	39, 600, 000	34, 600, 000	−32, 400, 000	−5, 000, 000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	30, 200, 000	13, 700, 000	13, 700, 000	−16, 500, 000	
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	76, 796, 000	102, 000, 000	91, 233, 000	+14, 437, 000	−10, 767, 000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	310, 000	310, 000	310, 000		

Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund		[18]			
Loan guaranty revolving fund (limitation on obligations)	*(300, 000, 000)*	Indefinite	*(257, 000, 000)*	*(−43, 000, 000)*	
Total, Veterans Administration	5, 384, 784, 000	5, 441, 941, 000	5, 423, 978, 000	+39, 194, 000	−17, 963, 000
Total, definite appropriations	13, 195, 505, 550	[19]14,216,543,400	13, 291, 698, 000	+96, 192, 450	−924, 845, 400
Total, indefinite appropriation of receipts (procceds of sales)	33, 312, 500	28, 142, 000	27, 267, 500	−6, 045, 000	−874, 500
Total appropriations, Title I	13, 228, 818, 050	[19] 14,244,685,400	13, 318, 965, 500	+90, 147, 450	−925, 719, 900

[1] Includes $50,000,000 in Public Law 88–296, approved April 7, 1964.
[2] Reflects reduction of $25,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[3] Reflects reduction of $1,400,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[4] Submitted in H. Doc. 195.
[5] Reflects reduction of $325,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[6] Reflects reduction of $465,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[7] Reflects reduction of $715,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[8] Reflects reduction of $98,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[9] Reflects reduction of $90,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[10] Reflects reduction of $140,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[11] Submitted in H. Doc. 304.
[12] Includes $4,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 203.
[13] Includes $141,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 203.
[14] Reflects reduction of $80,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[15] Includes $100,000 contained in H. Doc. 304.
[16] Reflects reduction of $1,000,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[17] Reflects reduction of $30,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[18] Language to reduce new obligational authority by $150,000,000.
[19] Includes $145,000,000 for 1964 supplementals.

Union Calendar No. 604

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

[Report No. 1413]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 18, 1964

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $500,000.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency Planning, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of the Office; $4,285,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $250,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available until ex-

pended for studies and research to develop measures and plans for telecommunications.

State and Local Preparedness

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop State and local programs for the effective use in time of war of natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization Functions of Federal Agencies

For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, $4,190,000.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and Technology, including services as authorized by section 15

of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $880,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Defense

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, $70,000,000, of which not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and not to exceed $13,500,000

shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions.

RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense, and for continuing shelter surveys and marking, $19,200,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the limitations on apropriations contained in Section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260).

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for civil defense activities.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service

EMERGENCY HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for carrying out emergency planning and preparedness functions of the Public Health Service, and procurement, storage (including underground storage), distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense medical supplies and equipment authorized by section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., App. 2281(h)), $8,500,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; $10,440,000.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, including not to exceed $3,000,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, $79,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $90,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; $21,805,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $600,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further,* That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes

or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775), $1,650,000.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3006), $10,650,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $1,138,000 of the funds in the "Employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001–3014), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS, RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3053), $14,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That, without regard to the provisions of any other Act, not to exceed $348,000 of the funds in the "Retired employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3051–3060), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the estimated cost of new and increased annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided by Part III of Public Law 87–793 (76 Stat. 868), $65,000,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed $270,000 of the funds in the "Employees life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) : *Provided,* That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed $10,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; purchase of twelve passenger motor vehicles, including eight for replacement only; and purchase and repair of skis and snow-

shoes; $537,600,000: *Provided,* That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $6,000,000 or include in excess of 396 positions: *Provided further,* That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); and purchase of eight aircraft; $50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing

appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

For grants-in-aid for airports pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, as follows: for the purposes of section 5 (d) (4) of such Act: $66,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; for the purposes of section 5 (d) (5) of such Act, $1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; and for the purposes of section 5 (d) (6) of such Act, $7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301–1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, $21,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $3,530,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for police type use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $4,319,000.

CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, $1,620,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Dulles International Airport, $180,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Money hereafter recovered from the pool and fountain at Dulles International Airport shall not be subject to the Act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484m, 485a), and may be given to a nonprofit organization which, in the determination of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, promotes and provides for the welfare of travelers in air commerce.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed $85,400), special counsel fees, improve-

ment and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $14,500), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $16,310,000.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, $12,180,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $12,725,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until

funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for an economic questionnaire or financial study of intercorporate relations.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Operating Expenses, Public Buildings Service

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; $213,800,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other removable facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its function of protecting the person of the President of the United States and his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President pursuant to Title

18, U.S.C. 3056: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation may be used to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year.

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; $90,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in con-

nection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration shall be considered to be public buildings.

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct and acquire public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of $200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including equipment for such buildings, $151,722,000, and not to exceed $500,000 of this amount shall be available to the Administrator for construction or alteration of small public buildings outside the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary, all to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

Federal office building, Centre, Alabama, $144,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Cullman, Alabama, $417,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Vernon, Alabama, $169,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Hope, Arkansas, $311,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Marshall, Arkansas, $178,100;

Post office and Federal office building, McCrory, Arkansas, $91,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Mountain Home, Arkansas, $179,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Blythe, California, $306,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Del Mar, California, $146,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Harbor City, California, $152,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Jackson, California, $255,600;

Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, in addition to the sum heretofore provided, $2,572,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Solana Beach, California, $146,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Weed, California, $126,700;

Federal office building, West Los Angeles, California, $13,101,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, $312,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Leadville, Colorado, $176,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor Locks, Connecticut, $240,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Cross City, Florida, $141,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Oakland Park Branch, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, $152,800;

Federal office building, Jacksonville, Florida, $6,266,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Gratigny Branch, Miami, Florida, $204,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Ocoee, Florida, $124,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Acworth, Georgia, $127,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Chatsworth, Georgia, $208,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Toccoa, Georgia, $282,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Warm Springs, Georgia, $70,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Arthur, Illinois, $110,600;

Federal office building, East St. Louis, Illinois, $773,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Edwardsville, Illinois, $342,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Red Bud, Illinois, $94,600;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, $1,900,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, $1,542,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Scottsburg, Indiana, $232,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Shoals, Indiana, $119,700;

Federal office building, Des Moines, Iowa, $7,931,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Scott City, Kansas, $281,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Wellington, Kansas, $259,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Clinton, Kentucky, $185,300;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Covington, Kentucky, $3,438,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Cumberland, Kentucky, $102,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Olive Hill, Kentucky, $148,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Paris, Kentucky, $218,100;

Federal office building, Richmond, Kentucky, $160,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Russell Springs, Kentucky, $86,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $3,393,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Crowley, Louisiana, $303,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Gueydan, Louisiana, $101,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Mamou, Louisiana, $72,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Mansura, Louisiana, $80,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Oberlin, Louisiana, $97,400;

Post office and courthouse, Opelousas, Louisiana, $903,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Thibodaux, Louisiana, $263,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Calais, Maine, $278,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Lubec, Maine, $104,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Machias, Maine, $220,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Centreville, Maryland, $205,000;

Post office and Federal office building, North East, Maryland, $114,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Prince Frederick, Maryland, $185,900;

Central heating plant, Suitland, Maryland, $3,213,000;

General Services Administration, Federal records center, Boston, Massachusetts, $883,800;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Boston-Lawrence area, Massachusetts, $3,748,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Marlboro, Massachusetts, $242,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Milford, Massachusetts, $274,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, $2,704,500;

Internal Revenue Service National Administrative Service Center and Regional Training Center Building, Detroit, Michigan, $2,925,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Lawton, Michigan, $89,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Mancelona, Michigan, $94,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Baudette, Minnesota, $159,700;

Courthouse and Federal office building, St. Paul, Minnestota, $8,993,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Bay Springs, Mississippi, $154,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Coldwater, Mississippi, $83,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Port Gibson, Mississippi, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Richton, Mississippi, $80,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Branson, Missouri, $142,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Crystal City, Missouri, $125,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Montgomery City, Missouri, $248,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Fullerton, Nebraska, $178,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Gothenburg, Nebraska, $147,800;

Post office and courthouse, Carson City, Nevada, $1,889,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Berlin, New Hampshire, $317,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Avenel, New Jersey, $133,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Burlington, New Jersey, $261,800;

Federal office building, Newark, New Jersey, $12,121,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Raton, New Mexico, $319,000;

Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $11,034,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Keeseville, New York, $106,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Andrews, North Carolina, $105,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Cary, North Carolina, $111,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Jacksonville, North Carolina, $274,700;

Federal office building, Kinston, North Carolina, $164,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Mars Hill, North Carolina, $101,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Raeford, North Carolina, $226,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Rich Square, North Carolina, $87,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Waynesville, North Carolina, $401,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor, North Carolina, $151,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Hillsboro, Ohio, $337,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Mantua, Ohio, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Afton, Oklahoma, $107,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Elk City, Oklahoma, $222,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Hugo, Oklahoma, $269,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Jay, Oklahoma, $174,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Baker, Oregon, $1,117,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Enterprise, Oregon, $195,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Prineville, Oregon, $252,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Scappoose, Oregon, $125,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Berwick, Pennsylvania, $267,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Brookeville, Pennsylvania, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Dallas, Pennsylvania, $151,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Duncannon, Pennsylvania, $92,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Falls Creek, Pennsylvania, $96,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Galeton, Pennsylvania, $119,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Hawley, Pennsylvania, $151,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Irwin, Pennsylvania, $224,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Montrose, Pennsylvania, $151,700;

Post office and Federal office building, New Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Cedarhurst Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Green Tree Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Pleasant Hills Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Youngsville, Pennsylvania, $96,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Humacao, Puerto Rico, $181,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Olneyville Station, Providence, Rhode Island, $235,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Elloree, South Carolina, $87,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Ridgeland, South Carolina, $246,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Williston, South Carolina, $91,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Oneida, Tennessee, $131,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Buffalo, Texas, $86,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Carthage, Texas, $235,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Fairfield, Texas, $168,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Gonzales, Texas, $224,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Naples, Texas, $104,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Sulphur Springs, Texas, $279,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Heber, Utah, $161,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Provo, Utah, $378,000;

Post office and Federal office building, St. Johnsbury, Vermont, $335,000;

Franconia warehouse building, Franconia, Virginia, $5,800,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Cle Elum, Washington, $120,200;

Federal office building, Colville, Washington, $393,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Newport, Washington, $136,700;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Spokane, Washington, $6,385,500;

Federal office building, Vancouver, Washington, $426,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Gassaway, West Virginia, $115,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenville, West Virginia, $159,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Parsons, West Virginia, $171,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Pineville, West Virginia, $157,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Summersville, West Virginia, $232,200;

Post office and Federal office building, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, $129,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Eagle River, Wisconsin, $152,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Elroy, Wisconsin, $113,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Horicon, Wisconsin, $120,800;

Housing and Home Finance Agency building, District of Columbia, $26,027,100:

Provided further, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum: *Provided further,* That the amount of $840,300 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1961 and 1962, for projects at Vanceboro, Maine, Pembina, North Dakota, and Wyandotte, Michigan, is hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation, and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the Post Office and Federal office building at Augusta, Maine, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, is hereby increased by $460,000.

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the

Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), $9,885,000.

EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to provide, directly or indirectly, additional space for the United States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and furnishings; $1,030,600.

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system (including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and other supply management and related activities, as authorized by law, $48,920,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, UTILIZATION AND DISPOSAL SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property, and rehabilitation of personal property, as authorized by law, $9,512,500, to be derived from proceeds from the

transfer of excess property and the disposal of surplus property.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, $14,955,000, including $25,000 which shall be available for continuing to carry out the purposes of Sec. 2 of Public Law 88–195 approved December 11, 1963, for the period ending June 30, 1965.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation, communications, and other public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $5,465,000.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h), during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including

charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), not to exceed $1,500,000 for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including reimbursement for security guard services, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $2,875,000 for operating expenses, $17,755,000, to be derived from sales of strategic and critical materials: *Provided,* That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Act provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accord-

ance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further,* That any receipts from sales during the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury except as otherwise provided herein: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and, after compliance with the disposal requirements of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, excess materials in the national stockpile established pursuant to that Act, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, $1,505,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $500 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of

the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (78 Stat. 153), $400,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $310,000: *Provided,* That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund: *Provided,* That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further,* That the total amount deposited into said account for the current fiscal year from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed $19,565,000: *Provided further,* That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the

amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Appropriations to the General Services Administration under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"

made in this Act shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be in-

creased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided,* That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose space for any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies at an estimated cost of construction in excess of $200,000 or for the payment of the salary of any person who executes such a lease agreement: *Provided,* That the foregoing proviso

shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for the lease construction of space has been submitted to and approved by the appropriate Committees of the Congress in the same manner as for public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $15,525,000: *Provided,* That during the current fiscal year non-administrative expenses, as defined by law (77 Stat. 437), shall not exceed $3,250,000.

Urban Planning Grants

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $2,350,000.

Urban Studies and Housing Research

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, $387,400.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, MASS TRANSPORTATION DEMONSTRATIONS

For necessary expenses in connection with mass transportation demonstration projects, as authorized by section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $100,000.

OPEN SPACE LAND GRANTS

For expenses in connection with grants to aid in the acquisition of open-space land or interests therein, and with the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), $15,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $262,000 may be used for administrative expenses and technical assistance, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with grants requiring payments in excess of the amount herein appropriated therefor.

PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), $1,000,000, together with such additional sums not to exceed $3,000,000 as may be necessary to restore to said revolving fund the amounts which are not required to be repaid pursuant to section 702 (g) of the Housing Act of 1954,

as added by section 6 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (40 U.S.C. 462g), to be immediately available.

URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $200,000,000.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), $25,000,000.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), $200,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, $15,484,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; and purchase of not to exceed thirty-six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $25,260,000, of which not less than $1,889,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $1,261,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided,* That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Research and Development

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance and operation of other than admin-

istrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; $4,345,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For advance planning, design and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $245,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; purchase or hire of not to exceed two aircraft for administrative use; maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase and hire of motor vehicles (including purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles, of which thirty-four shall be for replacement only); and maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; $610,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without consent of the Congress.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, $37,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing

Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $420,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any

other agency of the government for research without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $2,600,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $14,680,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $38,000 for the Na-

tional Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; $39,440,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for and recognition of war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; reimbursement of the Department of the Army for the services of the officer assigned to the Veterans Administration to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; $155,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for

each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, as authorized by law, $14,200,000.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $36,000,000, of which $1,170,000 shall be for prosthetic research and development activities.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational articles and facilities; maintenance, operation and acquisition of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not

otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of eighty-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code; $1,115,935,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided,* That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, burial flags, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19,

1924, as amended, and for payment of amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C. 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions of 38 U.S.C. 351, $3,963,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as saved from repeal by section 12 (a) of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1264), and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, $34,600,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, $13,700,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the

Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, $91,233,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Texas, is reduced from "$2,000,000" to "$1,990,000".

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, $310,000.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed $257,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided,* That the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal

year, for transfer to said Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

The appropriation available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be

available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board, to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this

title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may

be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation of Administrative and Nonadministrative Expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Not to exceed a total of $3,670,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which may procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and contracts for such services with one organization may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances therefor in accordance with the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131–2133), and said amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided,* That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and

Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 6 (i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further,* That expenses of any functions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation

in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449) : *Provided further,* That the nonadministrative expenses (except those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed $13,120,000 for not to exceed 1,000 positions.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $225,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation

may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730a).

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, College Housing Loans

Not to exceed $1,900,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed $1,220,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $110,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-

loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Not to exceed $915,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed $8,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (includ-

ing services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $9,000,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act,

as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed $1,500): *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed $75,000,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433), including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects

will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed $1,420,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half

time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1965".

Union Calendar No. 604

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

[Report No. 1413]

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THOMAS

MAY 18, 1964

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued May 21, 1964
For actions of May 20, 1964
88th-2nd; No. 101

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....34
Agricultural appropriations.....1
Appropriations...1,3,20,30
Area redevelopment.....8
Awards.....28
Civil defense.....3
Civil rights.....18
Committee assignments...11
Commodity exchange.....26
Conservation.....16,28
Cotton.....27
Cuban agriculture.....24
Electrification.....17
Expenditures.....6
Extension work.....35
Farm program.....32
Fishery research.....28
Foreign aid.....10,29
Foreign currency.....9
Foreign trade..... 5,15,32
Livestock.....19
Marketing.....23
Meat labeling.....32
Pay.....4,31
Peanut laboratory.....1
Personnel.....4,31
Pesticides.....13
Pollution.....22
Poverty.....12,29
Protein.....14
Recreation.....27
Research....1,3,7,25,30,28
Tobacco.....1,34
Transportation.....2,23
Virgin Islands.....21
Vocational training.....23
Waste disposal.....7
Watersheds.....26
Wheat.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed agricultural appropriation bill. House Rules Committee cleared pay bill. House debated independent offices appropriation bill. Rep. Cleveland charged that "discriminatory" freight rates threaten New England poultry and dairy industry. Rep. Moore contended that Trade Expansion Act has been a failure. Sen. Byrd (Va.) inserted editorial critical of poverty program. Sen. McGee inserted bulletin which claims cattlemen have contributed to beef oversupply. Sen. Hruska urged additional aid for livestock industry.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. By a vote of 311 to 64, passed with an amendment this bill, H. R. 11202 (pp. 11042-62, 11072-3). A point of order by Rep. Pelly was sustained striking out language in the bill providing that after June 30, 1963, the portion of CCC borrowings from Treasury equal to the unreimbursed realized losses recorded on the books of the Corporation after June 30 of the fiscal year in which such losses are realized, shall not bear interest and interest shall not be accrued or paid thereon (p. 11050).

Rejected the following amendments:
By Rep. Findley, 56 to 101, which would have prohibited the use of funds for any

expenses incident to the assembly or preparation of information for transmission over Government-leased wires directly serving privately owned radio or television stations or newspapers of general circulation, or for the preparation of information to be transmitted over Government-leased wires which are subject to direct interconnection with wires leased by non-governmental persons, firms, or associations. pp. 11042-6

By Rep. Dingell, to prohibit the use of funds in connection with any price support program for tobacco. pp. 11050-5

By Rep. O'Hara, 31 to 44, to provide that CCC funds shall not be available for any expense incident to requiring persons engaged in the processing of wheat into flour to acquire domestic marketing certificates equivalent to the number of bushels of wheat contained in the wheat clears produced by them having an ash content of one percent or more. pp. 11055-7

By Rep. Findley, 66 to 91, to prohibit the use of funds to make export payments or export subsidies on any agricultural commodities being sold to Communist countries (pp. 11057-8). Later, a point of order was sustained against an identical amendment by Rep. Findley, except for a proviso that such payments would be permitted if the President determines them to be in the national interest (pp. 11058-9).

By Rep. Pilcher, 181 to 198, to provide $1,600,000 for a quality peanut research laboratory to be located at Dawson, Ga. (p. 11060). This amendment had been agreed to during debate yesterday.

By a vote of 186 to 187, rejected a motion by Rep. Bow to recommit the bill to committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment prohibiting the use of funds to make export payments or export subsidies on any agricultural commodities sold to Communist countries. p. 11061

A point of order by Rep. Findley was overruled which would have stricken language providing not to exceed $25 million in Sec. 32 funds to increase domestic consumption of farm commodities. pp. 11046-7

A point of order was sustained against an amendment by Rep. Michel which would have provided that not to exceed $5.3 million of the REA authorization would be available in the form of grants to aid Alaskan REA borrowers. pp. 11048-50

2. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Cleveland stated that "New England suffers from a discriminatory differential in rail freight rates for feed grains that threatens to destroy our poultry and dairy industry," and inserted a letter he had received critical of the freight rates. pp. 11074-5

3. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 11296 (pp. 11063-66). This bill includes funds for the Office of Emergency Planning, including $4,190,000 to carry out civil defense and defense mobilization functions delegated to Federal agencies, Office of Science and Technology, President's disaster relief fund, Department of Defense civil defense activities, Civil Service Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, GSA public buildings and stockpiling activities, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, and National Science Foundation. Also, the bill includes prohibitions on indirect expenses of research grants exceeding 20 percent of direct costs, and on the use of funds to establish a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program. With regard to the civil defense item for the Department of Defense, the Committee report states that the "entire fallout shelter program is under study and review by the Department of Defense at the present time and the

Committee recommends no additional funds for stockpiling shelter supplies or new programs proposed in the budget."

4. PAY. The House Rules Committee granted a rule for consideration of H. R. 11049, the Federal pay raise bill. D396
Rep. Udall inserted a table showing legislative salary increases contained in the pay bill. p. 11069

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Moore criticized trade activities under the Trade Expansion Act, calling attention to the "creeping export trade" and the "sharp increase in the imports" of certain products, including beef and woolens which he said is causing "misgivings not only about the further slashing of tariff rates but about our existing position." pp. 11071-72

6. EXPENDITURES. Rep. Alger states that there has been "no real cut" in Federal spending and cited the funds sought for the poverty campaign, and the additional funds for aid to Vietnam, in support of his position. p. 11075

7. WASTE DISPOSAL. Rep. Roosevelt spoke in support of his bill to provide research technical and financial assistance relating to the disposal of solid wastes. pp. 11076-7

8. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Sen. Gray commended the work of ARA, mentioning particularly assistance given southern Illinois through a loan granted a Carbondale firm, creating jobs for many unemployed persons. p. 11078

9. FOREIGN CURRENCY. Received from the Treasury a report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of December 31, 1963. p. 11079

10. FOREIGN AID. Received from the Export-Import Bank of Washington a report relating to shipments to Yugoslavia insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank under the short-term export credit insurance program. p. 11079

11. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Rep. Albert Watson resigned from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 11062
Reps. Albert W. Watson and Fred B. Rooney were elected as members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. p. 11062

SENATE

12. POVERTY. Sen. Byrd (Va.) inserted an editorial opposing the poverty program as being a "grandiose" plan, a huge cost to taxpayers, and a program without assurance that it will work. pp. 11125-6
Sen. Dodd was added as cosponsor of S. 2642, the poverty bill. p. 11086

13. PESTICIDES. Sen. Ribicoff inserted an article giving instructions for the protection of pets where pesticides are used. p. 11091

14. PROTEIN. Sen. Lausche discussed and inserted an article on the possible conversion of wood pulp, sugarbeets, and molasses into protein as an aid toward solving the food problems of the world. p. 11095

15. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Javits inserted a summary and report of the Republican Citizens Committee urging an increase of American Exports as far as world markets would permit. pp. 11122-5

Sen. Thurmond commended the AFL-CIO for its opposition to any expansion of Western trade with the Communists. p. 11129

16. CONSERVATION. Sen. McGovern congratulated Sen. Anderson for being given an award for his work in the field of conservation. pp. 11099-11100

17. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Bartlett inserted a review of Sen. Gruening's book which is critical of the activities of the private power companies in their fight with local power companies. pp. 11108-9

18. CIVIL RIGHTS. Continued debate on H. R. 7152, the civil rights bill. pp. 11121-3, 11141-9, 11158, 11161-4

Sen. Humphrey inserted his newsletter explaining the effects of the civil rights bill on the farmer as only requiring him not to refuse to hire a person solely because of his race or his religion. pp. 11111-2

19. LIVESTOCK. Sen. McGee inserted a bulletin stating that the cattlemen themselves have contributed to the oversupply of beef in America by increasing the numbers of cattle on feed and by feeding cattle to extra heavy weights. pp. 11116-7

Sen. Hruska criticized administration policies for aiding the livestock as being insufficient, challenged figures used by the President on meat imports and prices, and inserted several items on the matter. pp. 11129-31

20. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President a supplemental appropriation of $2,296,890 to pay claims against the U. S. (S. Doc. 74). p. 11082

21. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Received the report of the Board of the Virgin Islands Corporation for 1963. p. 11082

22. POLLUTION. Sen. Williams (N.J.) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2792, to provide for control of waste disposal in connection with the manufacture, formulation, or other processing of economic poisons under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. pp. 11086-7

23. VOCATIONAL TRAINING. Sen. Gruening inserted an article on the need of vocational training in Alaska, including the training of aviators and other transportation workers to aid the marketing of farm products in that State. pp. 11105-6

24. CUBAN AGRICULTURE. Sen. Dominick compared the changes in the agriculture and food situation of Cuba before and since the Castro takeover. p. 11136

25. RESEARCH. Sen. Morse complimented the establishment of two research centers on college campuses by the Office of Education along the same pattern as the agricultural experimental stations, and inserted a speech by the U. S. Commissioner of Education, "Research: Education's Neglected Hope." pp. 11153-5

[Roll No. 133]

Abernethy	Feighan	Moss
Adair	Fisher	Norblad
Andrews, Ala.	Forrester	Pelly
Ashmore	Garmatz	Pilcher
Auchincloss	Grant	Pool
Avery	Griffin	Powell
Baring	Hanna	Rains
Barrett	Harding	Rich
Bass	Hawkins	Roberts, Ala.
Becker	Hays	Rodino
Belcher	Hébert	Ryan, N.Y.
Blatnik	Henderson	St Germain
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman	Saylor
	Holifield	Scott
Brademas	Holland	Secrest
Bray	Huddleston	Selden
Brock	Johnson, Calif.	Senner
Broomfield	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Buckley	Kee	Short
Burton, Utah	Kilburn	Siler
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilgore	Sisk
Celler	Kluczynski	Skubitz
Clark	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Clawson, Del	Lankford	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Leggett	Steed
Corman	Lloyd	Talcott
Cramer	Long, Md.	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	McFall	Toll
Diggs	McMillan	Tuck
Dorn	Martin, Calif.	Utt
Dowdy	Martin, Mass.	Wickersham
Edmondson	Martin, Nebr.	Willis
Elliott	Matsunaga	Wilson, Charles H.
Ellsworth	May	
Fallon	Meader	Winstead
Farbstein	Miller, N.Y.	Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 325 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11296, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I state to my colleagues we understand we have our annual baseball game tonight and we would like to get out of here certainly no later than 15 or 20 minutes to 6. We want everybody to go to the game. Please cooperate.

We will try to finish this bill tomorrow. We are not going to ask for any record vote. We realize you have had a long, hard day and done a tremendous job. We are grateful for that. Bear with us just a few minutes longer and then we will move that the Commitee rise and we hope to come in tomorrow a 11 o'clock and work for about an hour. Then we will pay our final respects to our late beloved colleague, Chairman Cannon.

Following that, we will go back into Committee of the Whole and we should finish this bill in 2 or 3 hours.

My colleagues, may I say to you, we believe we bring you a good bill and we respectfully and prayerfully ask your consideration, your support and your help. We have about 25 agencies here and we are just about as unanimous as seven men can be on these several thousands of details—and there are just about that many wrapped up here.

We are all here. On the majority side, Mr. EVINS, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. SHIPLEY. On the minority side, we have our friends, Mr. OSTERTAG, Mr. WYMAN, and our beloved friend from North Caroline, Mr. JONAS. These gentlemen know as much about this bill and more than I do. We are all here and you are entitled to all of the information, certainly, that we have and if we cannot give it to you individually, we will give it to you together. You are entitled to it and if you ask for it, we will do our best to give it to you.

We have budget estimates here of about $14¼ billion. I will repeat those figures—round figures—about $14¼ billion.

Your committee has reduced this about $925 million. That is a lot of money too.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. In just 1 minute I will be delighted to yield to my able friend from Iowa.

The budget calls for about 294,700 jobs. We have reduced that about 6,800 jobs. That is a pretty good reduction.

Mr. Chairman, one of the finest men who has been in this House in my 25 or 27 years serves on this committee and he is going to retire. I do not know of finer man in this body on either side of the aisle nor a more valuable man than our ranking minority Member, our beloved friend, HAROLD OSTERTAG of New York.

Frankly, everybody on the subcommittee was unanimous. We tried to persuade him not to retire. We could not do that. Then we unanimously voted to overrule him. We said we would not let him retire. But somehow or other we lost. We depend upon his good judgment, upon that balance he brings to the committee. We depend upon him every day, and he delivers.

He is young. He is far too young to retire. That great district of New York is going to lose one of the most able men in the great New York delegation. It is going to lose one of the finest and most able men in this House. It will take a long time to replace him.

To the people of the great 37th District of New York, whom he has represented so ably in this body for these many years, I say I know they will miss him. The State of New York will miss him. The people of the United States will miss him. We in this House, on both sides of the aisle, will miss him.

We wish you the best of everything, whatever you may choose to do. Anyway, you have deserved this retirement. But we want you to come back. We want you to sit with us when you come back. We want you to hold our hands, as you have been doing for the past 10 or 15 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my able friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I feel sure the gentleman will join with me in expressing the hope that an equally able Republican will come to Congress from his district.

Mr. THOMAS. How well the gentleman expresses it. I will join my friend in at least three-fourths of that statement.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As has been so generously and affectionately stated by my good friend, my colleague and associate, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], this will probably be the last time I shall be privileged to join with him and the other members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee in presenting this most important appropriation bill.

I have been privileged to serve for 12 years on the Appropriations Committee, and for at least 10 years of that time I have been a member of this subcommittee as well as the subcommittee which deals with the Department of Defense.

As I leave the Halls of Congress after 33 years of public service to return to what might be termed private life, the privilege I have had in working on these many problems associated with appropriations, and more particularly the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which embraces some 25 important independent agencies of our Federal Government, has been a most rewarding experience. It has been rewarding in that there has been a great sense of satisfaction in the privilege and opportunity to learn by means of working with and across the table from the executives throughout our governmental structure, which gives you a greater feel of the magnitude of our Republic and of its many functions and operations. This has given me an intimate contact with the Government, as well as understanding. I want you to know that I shall miss it.

I shall reflect these services, in the realization as I leave, that there are others who will take my place; there are others who will carry on and, as you

carry on, we must recognize that no one of us can be recognized as indispensable.

You might be interested to know that in the short span of 12 of my 14 years in Congress, while having been a member of this committee, more than $980 billion or almost $1 trillion has passed through our hands. The Independent Offices Subcommittee during the past 10 years has appropriated $85-plus billion, and I am proud to say to you that among other things our subcommittee—this is our own subcommittee and not the entire Committee on Appropriations—has achieved reductions during these 10 years totaling $3,767 million. So you can readily understand that we just did not sit and chew our fingernails, but we have tried to do a job.

May I say, too, that among other things, in dealing with these appropriation matters for the Government within our committee, whether it be the whole Committee on Appropriations or our Subcommittee on Independent Offices, there is no partisanship, there is no dividing line; we work as a unit. I do not believe there is an ounce of politics involved in the opportunities and privileges of our work.

I might say that this year we have been involved in the taking of some 3,200 or more pages of testimony. Now, Mr. Chairman, as our subcommittee report indicates, we bring to you today the independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965 with recommended funds in the amount of approximately $13,319 million. This total covers some 25 independent agencies, including such large operations as the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the General Services Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Federal Aviation Agency. The limitation of time will not permit a detailed accounting of each and every agency covered in this important appropriation bill. However, I do want to take this opportunity to point out that consistent reductions have been made throughout the entire bill. This appropriation, as compared with the total budget estimates for fiscal 1965 of some $14,245 million, constitutes a reduction, as our chairman has indicated, of $926 million or an overall saving of 6.5 percent.

Generally speaking, it will provide for substantially less employment and we believe it will require greater efficiency and economy on the part of these several agencies. Although I shall not attempt to give you a breakdown of employment or positions by agencies, I can report to you that the budget estimate for fiscal 1965 calls for a total of 294,726 positions.

The committee has approved a total of 287,942, which is a reduction of 6,834 positions.

Mr. Chairman, among the agencies included in this bill where substantial reductions have been made is that of civil defense which, as you know, is under the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. Your committee has included $70 million to continue the present level of funding for the already established program of civil defense, and we have earmarked $15 million for matching grants to the States and to the local civil defense organizations in support of personnel and administrative expenses. However, the limitation of $13.5 million is included for management expenses.

In the field of civil defense, I call your attention to the fact that the committee approved an appropriation of $19,200,000 for research, for shelters, surveys and marking of which $10 million will be applied for studies and research while $9,200,000 will be utilized for the location and marking of additional shelter spaces. On the other hand, the entire fallout shelter program totaling $265 million has been eliminated primarily because the program is under study and review by the Department of Defense at the present time, and the fact that this particular shelter program has not been authorized by the Congress.

This bill includes other agencies closely associated with Defense and I am referring to the Office of Emergency Planning. Your committee has allowed funds for this agency at approximately the same level as that of last year. I might point out here that we have approved $20 million for disaster relief assistance to the States and local governments in the event of major disasters. As you know, this program is administered by the OEP under a delegation of authority from the President of the United States. We provided in the supplemental appropriation bill which was passed in April of this year, the sum of $50 million which was required for the disaster in Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, another important agency included in this bill is that of the Federal Aviation Agency. I call your attention to the fact that this important Agency has grown tremendously in recent years. This budget estimate amounted to some $832 million for this Agency. However, your committee has approved the sum of $775 million which constitutes a reduction of $56 million under the budget estimate.

As we indicate in our report the Agency's personnel has grown from 24,378 in the year 1958 to that of 47,000 this last year.

The general application of our reductions apply in the field of operations where $10 million has been reduced despite the increase of $9,600,000 over that of last year, primarily due to the Pay Act increases.

Considerable concern in and out of Congress has been engendered in the field of FAA operations, due to the announced plans to consolidate some 42 flight service stations throughout the United States. No funds—and I repeat, no funds—have been specifically reduced from this service and I call your attention once again to the fact that we are providing nearly $10 million more for operations than was provided last year. I believe that the Federal Aviation Agency will take another look at this picture before they actually take steps to bring about this consolidation and I am of the firm belief that no actual dollar savings would be made by such consolidation, particularly in the first year or two of such changes. These consolidations are costly in the first instances and it is my hope that appropriate adjustments can and will be made by the Federal Aviation Administrator, for whom I have a high regard.

We have found it possible to reduce facilities and equipment by $25 million in the FAA because of a large unobligated balance on hand at the end of this fiscal year. We believe the total of $176 million available for expenditures in this field during the year 1965 to be sufficient.

I might add that your committee deemed it wise to reduce the budget estimate for research and development for the Federal Aviation Agency by $21 million and I point out that our decision in that regard was based on the fact that supplemental funds have already been appropriated for that in recent years. We believe the $25 million included in the bill to be ample for this purpose.

I call your further attention to the fact that in this field of aeronautics, we have another agency known as the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is responsible for the regulation of the economic aspect of the domestic and international U.S. air carrier operations and common carrier operations of the foreign air carriers to and from the United States. The Board is also responsible for participation in the establishment and development of international air transportation. Included in the general responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board, we find that they are authorized to provide subsidies to local carriers and in that connection, your attention is called to the committee's recommendation of $79 million for this purpose—which is a reduction of merely $4 million over their budget estimates. We hope and believe that this sum will be adequate to meet the requirements of air carrier operating subsidies—over which the Civil Aeronautics Board has complete jurisdiction and control.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps one of the largest agencies in our Federal Government, one which has responsibility for many operations, including our public buildings, utilization and disposal service, National Archives, transportation and communications services, strategic and critical materials, and many other broadbrush operations—is that of the General Services Administration. Your committee felt it possible to effect a $66 million reduction for these many services out of a total budget estimate in the neighborhood of about $600 million.

Outstanding among the items in this bill under the General Services Administration relates to that of public buildings and public buildings construction and call your attention to the report—where on pages 9 and 10—you will find a complete list of the 149 new buildings for which funds amounting to nearly $152 million are provided. Based on previous practice and experience, your committee has effected a reduction of 10 percent across the board from the original budget estimates for these buildings—and the committee has urged the Administrator to continue the space efficiency ratios and special cost reductions which will still bring "good, functional, and efficient structures."

A part of the $65 million reduction is achieved by means of the elimination for

these several public buildings which were originally included in the budget estimates. Speaking of public buildings projects, a separate item entitled "Sites and expenses" which as you know covers the preliminary step to the construction for such services as acquisition of sites, planning and architectural requirements, your committee deemed it wise to eliminate the budget request for this purpose in the amount of $29,500,000.

I might point out to you that we based our recommendations on the principle that the construction program is considerably behind the funding for sites and planning and, with the already existing backlog of construction projects, there appears to be no point in adding to that list at this time.

Now let me turn for a moment to the field of housing and home finance only to mention in passing that the principal reductions in the varied programs relating to housing are based on limitations of legislative authorization. For example, we have approved $25 million to increase the capital in the revolving fund for direct loans for housing for the elderly to the $275 million ceiling as authorized despite the fact that the budget estimate amounted to $75 million.

In other words, we could not legally and properly include more than the $25 million because of the authorized ceiling as provided by law. Similar reductions have been made in urban planning grants, open space land grants and several other of the so-called housing programs because of exhausted authority.

Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to one of the largest and most important agencies of our Federal Government which is included in this bill, namely, the Veterans' Administration. Out of a total appropriation of $5.5 billion for our veterans, nearly $4 billion is required to meet our obligation to them in the form of disability compensation payments and pensions. More than 4½ million out of a total veteran population of about 22 million are receiving such benefits. According to the VA Administrator, we can expect the cost and obligation to our veterans to continue during the foreseeable future at this level. We have made no change in the budget request and the estimated obligation for this coming year is about $42 million above that of 1964.

I believe it important to mention the veterans' medical care and hospital program. The 170 veterans' hospitals constitute the largest system of this kind in the world.

It is expected that more than 730,000 veterans will be hospitalized during this next year. This means that we will operate 120,000 hospital beds and nearly 17,000 domiciliary beds. Included in this bill, you will find about $91 million for the funding of 9 hospital replacement projects and 14 modernizations, your committee has reduced the budget estimate for these purposes by $10 million in the belief that better contracts and plans will produce the same facilities at less cost.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that there are many other agencies in this bill and many other problems that warrant some attention. We have the Office of Science Technology, the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Trade Commission. We have the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Science Foundation and the Selective Service and many other agencies.

But, of course, one of the big money parts of this bill includes, as you well know, that of the space agency, or NASA. We have included a total of $5,200 million in this bill for the space agency program which embraces $141 million as a supplemental to the 1964 budget.

The budget request for NASA for fiscal 1965 amounted to $5,454 million. We have effected a reduction over the total budget request of $245 million.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill. I think your committee has successfully attempted to effect reasonable economies and reductions. We have tried to take into account the essentials and the programs, many of them are required and obligated by law. But the point remains that this $925 million reduction is no small amount and it will help toward the overall general reduction in our Federal budget and expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, once again I want to express my gratitude to our distinguished chairman for his warm and generous tribute to me. I want to say too that it has been a real pleasure and a privilege that I cherish very highly to have had the opportunity to work with my distinguished associates on this committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY] and my good and valued associates on my side of the aisle, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN]. We have been, I believe, a good team—a working team, a harmonious team and I am proud to have been associated with my colleagues on the team.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am very happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York on the clearness of the explanation he has just given to us on this bill and upon the high ability he has displayed during the 12 years I have served with him in the Congress. But beyond that, I think it would be less than proper if I did not point out that Congressman OSTERTAG and I had an association which began 19 years before those 12 years began here in the Congress. I had the opportunity as a political writer to cover his activities during those previous 19 years when he was a member of the New York State Legislature and when he served as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Cooperation in that legislative body. He was a great State legislator. He has been a great Congressman. I will say to those who are wondering about the political identity of the man who may succeed him that whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, he will have to be a pretty big man to be anywhere near the stature of HAROLD OSTERTAG.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise now to inform the House that at the appropriate time during the reading of this bill I will interpose points of order against those provisions relating to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which contain funds to be expended for the construction of an Electronics Research Center in Boston, Mass.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, in an attempt to obtain the files of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration relating to the Electronics Research Center and to reassert the rights of Congress.

On April 17, 1963, I wrote to NASA requesting them to make their files available to me. On August 27, 1963, they replied, refusing to do so. They have continued in this refusal ever since.

I wish to make it clear to this House and the Nation that NASA has refused to let me examine their files relating to the proposed Electronics Research Center, in spite of the fact that I am a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of this House, which is directly charged with the responsibility for this project.

Even more, Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, which must approve the funds requested for such a Center. As a member of this committee, and in committee session, I was refused the right to examine specific site reports made at the Boston area, for which the agency had spent $25,000.

There is no matter of national security involved here. What is involved here is the prerogative of Congressmen and of Congress itself. If I can be refused such files, any Member can, and I don't believe we should let this happen.

I can only conclude that there is something in the files that must be covered up.

Now NASA is before us asking us to appropriate money for this Center when the authorization bill has not yet been enacted into law. Ordinarily, I might look on their request for special favors with indulgence but, under the circumstances, I am constrained to believe that this body should not pass this bill out of order to accommodate an agency that has seen fit to figuratively slap it in the face. So long as the agency remains in "contempt of Congress," I will press my objection.

I do not have to remind the House that no hearings on the need for this Center have ever been held—even though it will cost $70 million to construct such a Center and an equal amount to operate each year thereafter.

I am sure you remember that last year this proposal was rejected by the sub-

committee, the full committee and both Houses of Congress, with instructions to the committee to reexamine the question of need for such a Center.

In spite of this, no hearings were allowed in our committee on this most important matter.

I am surprised to find that the Appropriations Committee is willing to countenance a situation where there are to be no files supplied, no witnesses called, and the facts regarding an important matter are not to be made public.

I have warned the House repeatedly that this proposal's main thrust is to creating an electronics complex in the city of Boston, with Federal dollars—your dollars—to take away from you and your area existing electronic manufacturing and research firms. There have been many pious denials of this but the mask is now off and what I said is confirmed by no one less than the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I hold in my hand the New York Times of Sunday, May 3, which contains an advertisement of about two-thirds of a page, which costs many thousands of dollars and which reads as follows:

NOW WITH NASA—ALL CONCERNED IN THE SPACE EFFORT MUST LOOK TO MASSACHUSETTS, SPACE CENTER OF THE WORLD

Congress made it official in mid-March—the NASA Electronics Research Center will be located in Massachusetts, and henceforth this area is the space center of the world. A permanent installation, the Center will direct and coordinate all the research and manufacturing programs bearing on the fundamental and critical aspect of our Nation's space effort—electronic systems and components.

The NASA decision to come to Massachusetts was painstakingly researched. And it was assisted by a remarkable team effort of the Commonwealth's labor, management, and government. The compelling advantages that NASA discovered, and the assistance encountered, are waiting for others. Our department of commerce has a wealth of material covering every aspect of every community in the Commonwealth—from industrial parks to public schools, from railroad sidings to ski tows, from water tables to marinas. All of this is yours for the asking—in complete confidence—as is every other assistance you may require.

Remember—Massachusetts means progress.

ENDICOTT PEABODY,
Governor.

And on the bottom is a coupon to be cut out by the interested firm and sent, in strictest confidence, to the Department of Commerce of Massachusetts.

I do not know in what other parts of the country this advertisement appeared, but I do know that the New York Times is delivered from one end of this Nation to another.

The threat on electronic competence in the United States of America has begun as predicted, even before this Congress has finally approved the project.

The plain fact is, as this advertisement shows, that the State of Massachusetts cannot wait and is impatient to reap the benefits from this politically inspired, federally financed project, at your expense.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this opportunity pass without joining the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee who does a better job of paying tributes than almost anybody I know, and my articulate colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] in paying a word of tribute to the gentleman from New York, HAROLD OSTERTAG.

I had the opportunity of serving with HAROLD for a number of years on the Committee on Agriculture. I knew him as a very conscientious, able member of that committee and as a very fine and warm friend. I have appreciated his friendship, as all Members have appreciated the quality of his service in the House.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the majority leader. It means much to hear his kind words.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to end these fine, well-meaning and certainly highly deserved words about the gentleman from New York, HAROLD OSTERTAG, but it is time to adjourn. I hope that my friend will understand when I move that the Committee rise. We want to continue this tomorrow for at least another hour, and I am going to be here leading the procession. I serve notice now.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

BACKLOG OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

(Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1964, I introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statistical study of the Federal Power Commission's tremendous case and dollar backlog. Practically all the data included in the study was taken from the annual reports issued by the Federal Power Commission.

On April 29, 1964, Chairman Swidler, of the Federal Power Commission, sent me a letter commenting on said study and requested that I introduced said letter in the RECORD. This I shall do.

What is most surprising about this letter is that the arguments do not controvert most of the facts contained in the original study which was compiled from the Federal Power Commission's own annual reports. Chairman Swidler's primary argument is that the statistic set forth in the original study for the dollar backlog of hydroelectric projects was erroneous. Yet, the 1963 Federal Power Commission annual report states that:

The 275 outstanding major licenses involved a total claimed or estimated cost of $5,776,996,678.

The most applicable definition of the word "outstanding," as set forth in the Oxford Universal Dictionary, is, "that remains undetermined, unsettled." If the original statistic was erroneous, I suggest to the Chairman that in the future the Federal Power Commission's annual report be drafted more carefully, with an eye toward avoiding misleading statements.

Chairman Swidler's letter may present a more grievous error. It sets forth the total cases pending for the year ended June 30, 1963. It is assumed he has utilized all the information available to the Commission to give us a complete picture of all cases pending and that "total cases pending" means what it says. Yet, Swidler's "total cases pending" figure does not include any electric rate cases or the number of applications filed under sections 204(a) and 203 of the Federal Power Act. If there are no such cases pending, one wonders whether the Federal Power Commission has abrogated its responsibilities under the Federal Power Act. If there are such cases pending, one wonders why Chairman Swidler has not included such cases in his total.

The remainder of the Chairman's letter substantially reaffirms the overall validity of the original study. For example, Swidler's letter shows a backlog of 5,719 cases as of June 30, 1963, a reduction of only 5 percent in the past 2 years. At this rate it will take the Commission 40 years to eliminate the backlog.

Chairman Swidler apparently accepts a number of facts set forth in the original study. Nowhere does he attempt to refute the fact that there were 427 more producer rate cases pending as of June 30, 1963, than were pending 2 years earlier, when he took office. The Chairman's own statistics set forth these same figures. Nor does he deny that the dollar backlog of pending pipeline certificate proceedings increased by $100 million for the same 2-year period. Again, his letter verifies this figure.

Nor does the Chairman attempt to deny that the pipeline rate settlements, which have proven very satisfactory, were vigorously initiated under the direction of the former Chairman, Mr. Kuykendall. This cannot be denied for it is a truism known to the Federal Power Commission staff and industry alike. Yet, last September when speaking of this reduction of outstanding pipe-

of compensation of positions in the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Branches. Establishes a Federal executive salary schedule divided into six salary levels. Establishes the rate of compensation of $32,500 for level I for Cabinet offices. Establishes the rate of compensation of $30,000 for certain level II offices. Establishes the rate of compensation of $29,000 for level III offices, including the Under Secretary of Agriculture. Authorizes the President to place offices and positions as he deems appropriate in levels IV, V, and VI, at rates of compensation of $28,000, $27,000, and $26,000, respectively, including assistant secretaries and general counsels of executive departments, heads of certain agencies and bureaus, and deputy heads of large agencies in level IV, heads of principal services in level V, and heads and board members of smaller agencies and deputy heads of other agencies in level VI. Changes the title of Administrative Assistant Secretary to Assistant Secretary for Administration. Provides that rates of compensation of ASC county committee employees shall be increased to correspond, as nearly as possible, with increases provided for classified employees. Increases from 9 to 10 the number of within-grade rates for grades GS-11 through GS-15, and from 5 to 9 the number of within-grade rates for grade GS-16. Authorizes the appointment of individuals at a rate above the minimum of the grade in grades GS-13 and above in special circumstances. Provides that the salary-fixing authority of heads of departments may not be used to fix rates in excess of the highest rate for grade GS-18. Requires Federal agencies to absorb, for fiscal year 1965, not less than 10 percent of the aggregate amount of the pay increases. Provides that pay increases for Members of Congress shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1965, and that other increases provided in the bill shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period after enactment, except that no salary shall be increased to more than $22,000 until the first pay period beginning after January 1, 1965

14. PERSONNEL UTILIZATION. Rep. Henderson praised the "teamwork of management and employees throughout the Government," and noted Administrative Assistant Secretary Robertson's statement on increased employee productivity in AMS. pp. 11324-5

15. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Dawson inserted the AID Administrator's address praising agricultural work overseas and Public Law 480 programs. pp. 11322-4

16. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Flood inserted the ARA Deputy Administrator's speech recommending the use of ARA to aid in the programs against poverty and for more jobs. pp. 11320-2

17. PRICES. Rep. Dent spoke in support of the "quality stabilization" bill as being "antimonopoly and supplemental to our Nation's antitrust laws." pp. 11312-6

18. WOOL; COTTON. Rep. Cleveland charged the Federal Government with "neglect" of the woolen industry while giving aid to the cotton industry. p. 11307

19. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Curtis stated that tariffs, as the chief means of protecting agricultural and nonagricultural industries, are now less significant in restricting imports and inserted an article, "Farm Commodity Exports and International Trade Policies." pp. 11303-7

20. ECONOMY. Rep. Curtis inserted articles "calling attention to the dangers of economic instability arising from the administation's highly expansionary economic policies." pp. 11302-3

21. CANNON EULOGIES. Several Representatives eulogized Rep. Cannon for his service to his country as a teacher, lawyer, author, parliamentarian, legislator, and statesman, with special praise for his fiscal responsibility as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee (pp. 11247-75). Rep. Cooley called him one of the great champions of agriculture and of farm families of the country and inserted excerpts from Rep. Cannon's recent statement before the Credit Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in behalf of conservation of soil and water resources (pp. 11268-9).

22. PERSONNEL; AWARDS. Rep. Nelsen inserted his previous statement objecting to a distinguished service award being given to the ASCS Administrator, and excerpts from the hearings in the Billie Sol Estes investigation to support his claim that the Administrator "coached witnesses." pp. 11290-1

23. POVERTY. Rep. Frelinghuysen inserted an Education and Labor Committee minority staff analysis and commentary with respect to H. R. 10440, the povery bill, describing it as largely duplicative of programs already being carried forward by the Federal Government and containing tables showing amounts of money budgeted for various federal programs including those administered by this Department. pp. 11291-3

24. PROCUREMENT. Rep. Curtis inserted a Harvard Business Review article critical of the government's procuring process and stated that the issue posed by the article is that unless congressional controls are instituted, industry will have to continue to accept whatever encroachments the executive branch decides to make upon management decision and control. pp. 11297-02

25. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965. Passed with amendment this bill, H. R. 11296 (pp. 11239-47, 11276-90). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Harris, 59 to 56, to require the continuation, for 12 months, of domestic flight service stations which provide weather information to airplanes used by farmers (pp. 11280-7).

26. EDUCATION. Rep. Conte inserted an address urging that the building of education, health, and welfare services in our communities be directed toward a common goal, including vocational education and poverty services. pp. 11317-8

27. MARKETING. Rep. McDowell criticized the closing of supermarkets serviced by Baltimore, Md., warehouses in Md. and Del. pp. 11326-7

28. USER CHARGES; INSPECTION STANDARDS. Received from this Department a proposed bill to repeal the Grain Standards, Wool Standards, Standard Containers, Naval Stores, and Tobacco Seed Export Acts; to Agriculture Committee. p. 11328

29. TRANSPORTATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3881, to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. p. 11328

30. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Speaker McCormack announced that the military construction appropriation bill will be considered Tues., and that H. R. 4198, free importation of instant coffee, and H. R. 10465, free importation effects under Government orders, will be considered on Wed. p. 11312

31. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 25. p. 11327

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1964

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rabbi Hersh M. Ginsberg, dean, Rabbi Jacob Joseph School, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Hashem, Melech Haolom!
Lord, King of the Universe!

Bless this House of Representatives of the United States of America, which has been hallowed as a sanctuary of freedom, and wherein is preserved the liberty and human dignity of all Americans.

The men and women gathered here have toiled laboriously to guard against any encroachment on the inalienable rights which Thou hast granted unto man. We are mindful that only through Thy grace have their labors borne fruit and has our blessed country fostered hope for the oppressed, given confidence to the downtrodden, and inspired the feeblehearted.

We are humbled by the ominous tasks that still lie ahead; for we can never remain tranquil so long as freedom is denied to any human being created in Thy image; so long as man is judged and governed by his fellow man not by the nobility of his spirit and the grandeur of his heart, but by the color of his skin, by the political doctrines to which he subscribes, or by the religion to which he is committed. Indeed, our aspirations of making the American dream of universal freedom for all men a reality will continue to command our collective attention in the months and years that lie ahead.

Grant, we pray Thee, O merciful Father, to the dedicated men and women gathered here, unto whom has been entrusted the sacred task of governing our Nation, that they may continue to be deserving of Thy sustaining blessings. Shower upon them and their loved ones of Thy divine bounty, teach them to face the trying days ahead firmly and courageously, fill them with Thy holy spirit, make them meek and humble, cognizant of the needs of the poor of body and impoverished of spirit, and inspire them to remain steadfast in their yearning to sanctify Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that in the light of the eulogies for our late beloved colleague, Mr. CANNON, the Chair will not receive unanimous-consent requests at this time. The Committee will rise at 12 o'clock, and before we go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union again, the Chair will receive unanimous-consent requests at that time.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 11296, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] had 55 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] had 31 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

(Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], on yesterday explained this bill in some detail, as did the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. Chairman, at the expense of some repetition, I will emphasize some of the highlights of this very important bill, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1965.

Before doing so, Mr. Chairman, I want to pay a tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], for the excellent manner in which he has conducted these hearings and for the great work which he has done on this bill. As in the past, ALBERT THOMAS has shown that he knows the workings of these agencies of our Government perhaps better than any single Member of the House of Representatives. He has demonstrated that he has a wider grasp of the workings and budgetary needs of these many agencies of the Government than many of heads of agencies themselves. Along with his exceptional store of knowledge of the various agencies, he has a keen mind, a great insight, and a rare understanding for fair dealing and wisely with everyone coming before our committee. He is indeed an outstanding chairman and it has been a great pleasure to serve with him, as it has with all of the other members of the committee; these include the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the ranking minority member of the committee; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]; and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend, the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for paying this more-than-deserved tribute to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I feel that one of the most fortunate things that has happened in this House in a long time was when his good constituents and his colleagues convinced him that we needed him here during this next term and during many future Congresses.

Mr. EVINS. We all concur in the sentiments of the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, as was said on yesterday, this is the last time that our genial friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], will participate with the committee in the preparation of recommendations and consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill.

I want to join with others and to reemphasize what others have said on yesterday that we shall miss him, and that our best wishes will go with him in whatever activities he may pursue in the future.

He has made a great contribution to this bill and to all the deliberations and work of our committee throughout the period of his devoted service on the committee. His diligence, his fairness and his outstanding abilities have earned for him the regard and respect of all of his colleagues. I know that I express the feeling of all Members in wishing him a happy and richly rewarding retirement—good luck, good health, and Godspeed.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is a big bill and a most important bill. Cer-

tainly it is one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills considered by the Congress.

Our subcommittee has held extensive hearings on this bill—some 4 months of hearings. There are two volumes of testimony—thick volumes—containing almost 4,000 pages of testimony. Every item in this bill has been thoroughly studied. The committee has gone into exhaustive details and considered carefully all of the budget requests.

This bill carries funds for some 25 independent offices and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Office of Emergency Planning, National Space Council, Civil Aeronautics Board, Civil Service Commission, Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, General Services Administration, National Science Foundation, and the Veterans' Administration, among others.

We are funding in this bill programs and services of these agencies which in one way or another affect the lives of all of the citizens of our great country.

We are recommending this bill as a good bill. It has been well considered and we believe it is a well-balanced measure.

Our committee is recommending a total appropriation of $13,318,965,500 for the 25 agencies and offices carried in this bill.

This is $925,719,900 less than the budget recommendation. We have thus made a substantial cut and reduction—a cut of almost $1 billion from the budget estimates. This represents an overall saving of 6.5 percent.

The fund reductions made in this bill provide for substantially less employment in a number of agencies—without curtailment in essential Federal services.

A total of 287,942 positions have been approved. A total of 6,834 positions have been eliminated.

The reductions made will provide for a more economical and efficient operation of all the Federal agencies concerned.

Among the major cuts made in this bill is in the funding for civil defense. The committee feels that this Agency can well afford the $268.8 million cut from budget estimates for civil defense. The amounts that have been appropriated and expended over the years for civil defense has been enormous. The State and local governments must make a greater contribution in this effort.

With the entire shelter program under study and review by the Department of Defense at the present time, our committee recommends that no additional funds for stockpiling of shelter supplies or for new programs proposed in the budget be approved.

Another important budgetary reduction which we are proposing is in the appropriation for the Federal Aviation Agency. The total cut recommended is some $56 million less than the budget estimates.

With this action, efforts are being stepped up to achieve greater efficiency and more economy in the operation of this Agency which has grown greatly in recent years. The Agency's fund requests for fiscal 1965 show a reduction of 754 in personnel. As pointed out in the report, our committee commends the able and genial Administrator of FAA—Administrator N. E. "Jeeb" Halaby. He is doing an outstanding job—rendering a great public service. We feel that his Agency is somewhat "top heavy" and that with the reductions FAA can be made even more efficient in its operations.

While making provision for improvement in the efficiency of this important Agency, the committee wants to stress the need for increased emphasis on air safety.

We have included $75 million for the 1965 program for airport construction, and a like amount for advance funding on the 1966 program—the full amount requested. We are recommending $50 million for new facilities and equipment. The total provided for FAA—$775,249,000—is nearly $17 million more than the amount appropriated last year. This increase is due to the inclusion of programs that were not in last year's budget.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves the subject of airports?

Mr. EVINS. I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much do the taxpayers of the Nation now have in that white elephant, Dulles Airport? Does the gentleman have any figure in mind as to the total amount that has been invested? And I would like to know how much is in this bill for Dulles Airport?

Mr. EVINS. Dulles Airport has been completed. It has been more costly than was anticipated. The airport has been dedicated and is in operation. The airport is a great showcase and it is the airport of the future. It has been very costly, I will say to my friend. We have to provide about $3 million or $4 million annually now to keep it going—operating efficiently.

Mr. GROSS. I read somewhere or I have heard that the loss on that airport last year was close to $6,900,000 or almost $7 million. Can that be possible? Was that the amount of the loss for last year alone?

Mr. EVINS. It is true that the airport is not having the enplanements and the air traffic that was earlier anticipated. But we feel in the future it will reach its maximum and the expected goals and fulfill our expectations. Of course, there is competition with Friendship Airport and other airports, but Dulles Airport will serve a most useful and important purpose in the long run.

Mr. GROSS. How much is being appropriated for Dulles Airport today out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country to make up the deficit? Does the gentleman have a figure in mind?

Mr. EVINS. The details of the funding for Dulles are set out in the report. We are appropriating for next year $4,319,000 and $180,000 for construction at this important airport.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend, the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my distinguished friend from Iowa, the details are available here. They wanted for maintenance, operation, minor construction and so on about $4½ million this year or to be exact $4,619,000. The committee reduced it by $300,000. How may I explain, if I may, to my able friend from Iowa that we have tied up in that airport about $108 million. When we went into that business out there, as our friend, the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from New York will verify, we demanded of them in so many words to amortize this over a 30 year period. By that we meant to pay back every nickel that the taxpayers have put into it—land cost, improvement costs and interest costs. It is slipping and, as a matter of fact, they lacked about $6 million of carrying out their part of the contract this year. But as the gentleman from Tennessee pointed out, the business is going and picking up and picking up. So give them 21 or 22 years and we hope that it will begin to pay itself off.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield so that I may ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Your hearings show, I believe, that their loss last year was $7 million or $6,900,000.

Mr. THOMAS. There was a slippage of $6,900,000—the gentleman is right.

Mr. GROSS. And you are providing this year $4,319,000. What about the differential as between the loss and the the money you are appropriating?

Mr. THOMAS. One has to go back to the original cost. That is supposed to be amortized over a period of 30 years. How is it amortized? There are the concessions. You have, say, 100 tenants out there. One of them is for soft drinks and one for restaurants and one for newspapers and then there are the landing fees for all the airplanes, and the booths for airplane companies and so forth and so on. So the sum total of that is that it is supposed to be paid for over a 30-year period. But the slippage amounts to the $6,900,000. You are right about that.

Mr. EVINS. Concerning the Housing and Home Finance Agency, our committee is recommending a cut of $172 million below the budget estimates for all programs of this Agency. Cuts have been made in proposed outlays for urban planning and urban renewal grants, the purchase of open lands. The programs are fully funded at this time.

For the General Services Administration, we are recommending $565,260,100. The committee has provided a reduction of $66 million in the budget's estimates for this Agency.

The total amount carried in the bill for GSA in fiscal 1965 is some $49 million less than appropriated in 1964. The bill contains $151,722,000 for construction of 149 new buildings. We have increased the funding for two projects under construction and for the acquisition and purchase of one building needed by the Government. This will provide a large

and substantial public buildings construction program.

The amounts for construction projects generally have been reduced about 10 percent from the budget estimates. Fallout shelters have been eliminated in the construction of these proposed new public buildings.

As pointed out in the report, the committee is not recommending any funds for sites or planning by GSA for next year since GSA has been overfunded for this work, and there is a lag in sites and planning program.

Funds requested for the expense of operating Government-owned and leased buildings have also been reduced by the committee, and the amount provided for the Federal Supply Service's operating expenses is substantially below budget estimates.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. A number of us are concerned about the decision of the committee not to recommend any funds for site planning. I think the total amount, if you approved the entire amount, would have been $29,500,000. I have no quarrel with the collective judgment of the committee. I feel certain it is based on sound grounds. However, there are a number of us who have proposed Federal buildings in our districts. There is one in the city of Albany which is badly needed, which will save money for the taxpayers of the United States.

I should like to ask the gentleman a question concerning this. The decision not to recommend any funds for sites this year will not delay to any appreciable extent the date upon which the Federal building, needed and approved, will be under construction, will it?

Mr. EVINS. I will say to my friend that there will not be a delay. The GSA is fully occupied. They are fully funded. They have more work in sight than they can do at this time. There is a lag in the sites and planning work. But GSA will catch up. I feel certain that the gentleman's project will be included and will be built on schedule.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman one more question. Was there anything in the decision to prevent the General Services Administration, during the days and months ahead, from talking privately with people in the communities where buildings are to be constructed, to see if they can negotiate, when the funds are available, favorable terms?

Mr. EVINS. There is nothing to preclude them from proceeding. I feel certain they will proceed on priority projects.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. This bill reduces total appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by $245 million below budget estimates.

With this reduction in the NASA appropriation for 1965, the space agency still will have $5.2 billion for carrying forward the national space effort.

We have approved $4.2 billion for research and development—and the greater part of this goes for contracts with industry.

We have aproved $250 million for the construction of additional needed facilities and $640 million for administrative operations.

In short, we have provided the funds needed for continuation of a full-scale space effort—under a program that calls for progress in this area on an economical basis and a better balanced Federal effort in the field of space exploration.

NASA has cut its own budget from an earlier planned program.

The Bureau of the Budget has also made reductions as has the President—President Johnson—in submitting his budget to the Congress.

Both the space authorizing committee and our Appropriations Subcommittee have made further cuts and reductions.

We must reach a composite judgment on the fund needs and fund requirements for the space effort of our country.

I have concluded, as the majority of our subcommittee and the full committee have concluded, that the $5.2 billion is the right level.

We are told that a further cut and a slowdown—and stretchout—will mean a billion dollars in increase costs—because of delays, increased labor costs, increases in construction, administrative and other costs.

So, we can save a billion dollars by approving the amount here recomended—and we will not be killing the momentum of effort or bringing about a slowdown in the program, as planned.

Concerning the National Science Foundation, this bill provides some $420 million for various programs of the Science Foundation, including grants for scholarships—fellowships, research, education, basic and applied sciences, and funds for developing new centers of excellence in science and engineering.

Other important agencies for which funds are provided in this bill include the Civil Aeronautics Board under the able direction of Chairman Alan S. Boyd; the Federal Trade Commission under the direction of another able chairman, Paul Rand Dixon, of Tennessee; the Federal Power Commission, a most important Commission, whose Chairman is Joseph C. Swidler, who has a most important role to perform in the public interest; the Securities and Exchange Commission under Chairman Carey; the Civil Service Commission under Chairman Macy; and the Veterans' Administration, which is being well managed and operated by the genial and able Administrator of our veterans' programs, Col. John Gleason—to name only a partial list of the important agencies and administrators.

Mr. Chairman, a great amount of intensive and exacting work has gone into the determination of the fund needs of these agencies by your subcommittee.

The bill, as it comes before you today, represents the best efforts of our subcommittee to insure that all of these important agencies have sufficient funds to discharge properly their functions and duties—but without waste or extravagance.

With the passage of this appropriation bill, our Government will not be skimping on any essential services in any of the 25 agencies involved.

But we are making some substantial budgetary savings in the interest of better use of our resources.

In summary, we have made cuts and reductions totaling $925,719,000—almost $1 billion.

I repeat, this is a good bill—a sound bill.

It meets the high standards set by our late longtime chairman on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Cannon, and continued by his great successor, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Chairman GEORGE MAHON.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon the committee rose following the presentation by the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG]. At the conclusion of his presentation well deserved tributes were paid him by his colleagues. Because there was not the proper opportunity for me to add my own tribute then, I wish to do so today.

When HAROLD came to the Congress 14 years ago, he was already an experienced legislator, having served 19 years in the New York Legislature. During his service here in the House, it has been my privilege to be intimately associated with him and to count him among my best friends. His steadfastness and conscientiousness are blended with a congenial disposition that makes for a most effective public servant and delightful companion. I can only say that even though I regret his decision to retire, I understand his reasons and wish for him and his wonderful wife Grace, many years of pleasant retirement.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, of course a bill of this magnitude, involving $13 or $14 billion, cannot be discussed adequately in 10 minutes. I recommend to my colleagues that they read the report carefully and refer to the hearings. The report is detailed in explanation of what the committee did. The hearings were quite voluminous. Those who would like to know more about the bill than we can explain in the short time allocated this morning can obtain that information by reference to the report and to the hearings.

At the outset I would like to pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman of our committee and join with the majority leader in thanking his constituents for talking him out of retiring. I would say in passing that by making that decision he avoids the pleasure I am sure our colleague from New York is deriving out of the complimentary remarks that are being made about him during the course of this debate. It is rather a sad commentary on the situa-

tion that exists that a Member of the House must either die or retire voluntarily before any very complimentary remarks are made about him. Of course, after he has passed away, he cannot read the remarks, so those who retire voluntarily have a great advantage over those of us who are retired involuntarily, and we all face that prospect sooner or later. However, the gentleman from Texas has made a great contribution to the efforts of our committee to bring about sound economies in the operation of the Government. His services to the committee cannot be magnified unduly because they have been tremendous. It has been a genuine pleasure to serve over the years with our colleagues on his side of the table, my friends from Massachusetts, Tennessee, and Illinois

I cannot let the occasion pass, either, without paying my personal tribute to HAROLD OSTERTAG, the distinguished gentleman from New York who is voluntarily retiring at the end of this term. I have sat next to HAROLD in the committee room for 5 hours a day almost 5 days a week during this year and I have learned to know of the great care with which he scrutinizes these requests. I have formed the very highest appreciation of his ability and of his study of the problems and his mastery of the subject. The presentation he made yesterday afternoon just before the committee rose was indeed masterful, I thought. It is because of the very fine and detailed analysis that he gave to the bill that I deem it unnecessary for me today to go into any details about the bill.

I join with my colleagues who have spoken and who will speak about HAROLD OSTERTAG'S service to the Nation and extend to him, as he enters upon retirement, the cordial good wishes of myself and my wife and our very best hopes that he will find that retirement is as satisfying as he now thinks it may be. I am inclined to believe that he will at times, when in retirement, reflect upon the things that he is missing down here in Washington and particularly in the Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

Since I am passing compliments around, I could not, of course, refrain from saying how fortunate I think we are on our side to have the services of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

He has not served on the committee as long as some of the other members; but he has served on the committee long enough to impress all of us with his dedication to the responsibilities placed upon him. It has been a genuine pleasure to work with him in the conduct of the hearings and in the preparation of the bill. I am very proud to have had the opportunity of serving not only with him but with all of my other colleagues who have worked so hard and so harmoniously in an effort to bring to the committee this morning the bill which is, as the distinguished chairman said on yesterday, just about as unanimous as you could expect a bill of this magnitude and complexity to be, among seven Members of Congress who do not necessarily see eye to eye on all subjects. But I think in the main we are in agreement on the bill. There are some exceptions, of course. I would have changed some of the figures, downward I might add, but in most instances I recognize that where you have seven Members of Congress who are independent-minded the result of their deliberations will have to represent some give and take. Legislation is frequently the result of compromise, and I think on the whole we have a good bill which is worthy of the support of the members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would like during the few minutes available to me to call attention to one item that you will find discussed in the hearings on page 30 of part 2. I have a particular interest in this little item because it was my privilege to author the bill under which we now have in existence about 88 motor pools around the country, and by the end of fiscal year 1965 there will be 100 in operation around the country. The advantage of operating a motor pool is that if you have a dozen Government agencies in Chicago or St. Louis or Charlotte or Springfield or Manchester or anywhere in the United States, instead of giving a fleet of automobiles to each one of those agencies to use from time to time, we create a motor pool. When "X" agency has an employee who needs to make a trip by automobile he requisitions one from the pool. He may use it today and an employee of another agency may use it tomorrow; and so on, instead of leaving a fleet of automobiles parked in garages half the time. They are expensive. These employees drive a great many miles in the United States. In 1963, for example, and that is the last year for which figures are available, Government-owned, motor pool vehicles traveled 294 million miles.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think we could get the Government-operated Cadillac brigade into one of these pools in Washington?

Mr. JONAS. I wish we could. They should certainly be included but unfortunately they are not. I would merely add that I am pleased to be able to report to the committee that this motor pool operation has already saved the taxpayers $40 million through fiscal year 1963. These savings will increase from year to year at a rate estimated to be $12 million. That does not represent much money if you think in terms of billions. But if we can save $12 million a year on a simple motor pool operation, I believe it is worth saving.

Mr. Chairman, I also invite the attention of the committee to the fact that we in the subcommittee have been quite concerned over travel. Last year we found, for example, that the 25 civilian agencies represented in this bill were spending between $60 and $70 million a year for travel. I hope the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] heard that—$60-odd million a year for travel by a few civilian agencies.

Mr. Chairman, we have made substantial reductions in this field. Last year they asked for about $70 million and we reduced them to $64.9 million. This year they requested $67.1 million. We cut them down to $62.4 million. This is approximately $4.3 million under the budget and $2.3 million below last year's appropriation—still too much travel but the committee is still trying.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that no more time is available for me under the limited time available. There are a few other items I should mention, but will have to take some time under the 5-minute rule in order to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished and genial gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the time of this committee to dwell on the appropriations bill that now is pending before this committee. I believe the valedictory on yesterday of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] on the matters that are contained in this bill was one of the best statements I have heard on a legislative bill during the 10 years that I have served on the Committee on Appropriations. So, I will really take this time, Mr. Chairman, to pay my respects and to join with the distinguished and able gentleman from North Carolina with reference to his remarks on the statement which he made on the chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Chairman, I share with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and all the members of this subcommittee as well as all of the members of the full Committee on Appropriations and the entire House membership the joy and the delight and the happiness and the satisfaction of knowing that the people of Houston have forced the gentleman from Texas to change his mind and forced him to come back to this great legislative body.

Mr. Chairman, he has been a great Member of this body and certainly a giant among giants in the legislative field. I know of no man who has done more for his native city, for his State, or for his Nation than the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. THOMAS]. So, too, do I join with the members of this subcommittee in my expression of delight at having served with the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG]. He has served in the public life of his State and this Nation for some 32 years, 32 years of splendid and dedicated and spirited service. He comes from a great district in New York. He served that district in the legislative body of the State of New York and has now served for some 14 years in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure to serve with him on this particular Subcommittee on Appropriations for a period of 10 years. He has a keen and analytical mind and a fantastic sense of judgment. Those qualities have been a real bulwark to this subcommittee and to the full committee. I have never seen the gentleman in the years that I have served with him ever use the awesome power—and I say that advisedly—the awesome power that rests with the members of the Committee on Appropriations to abuse any witness at any time.

He has always been kind and considerate, and of course that is his nature.

Over the past 14 years he has received the enthusiastic support of the people of his district in returning him every 2 years to this body. He would have been returned without question overwhelmingly if he sought to seek reelection this year. He has been a credit to his district, to his State, and to his Nation. He has been a credit to his friends.

I wish for him and for his gracious and lovely wife many, many years of future happiness and future health.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the junior member of the team on this committee, I have had a very valuable and interesting experience working under our genial chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], whose gracious kindness and sophistication I think is exceeded only by his ability.

I have enjoyed working with our noted author, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], with our hard-working colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY], and learning under our senior colleague on the Republican side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], whom I am very disappointed to see leave us because of his helpfulness and because of his years of experience that seem sort of wasted when he retires. However, in a way, I do not blame him, knowing the work he has had to do.

I would like to say of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] that he carries a tremendous load in this subcommittee on our side, and although he has been under pressure at home to come back and run for Governor of his State he has decided to remain in Congress. I am glad that he has decided to remain here. The country needs his outstanding capabilities more even than does his home State.

There has been a lot of unanimity in this subcommittee. We have had it, except that once again I have felt compelled to file separate views relating to NASA funds—not out of a spirit of disharmony but out of a deep conviction that in an appropriation bill of $13.3 billion, of which more than $5 billion is for space, we should reduce somewhat the flow of our spending toward the moon. Think of it—five thousand million dollars—for a civilian space program, although we are no longer in a race with anybody to get to the moon.

Mr. Chairman, we are short of money. There should be some priorities established in spending somewhere and we ought to take a second look at it. I feel that the House in fairness to itself through the committee should consider itself in a position similar to that of a board of directors of a responsible corporation in this space program and the proper place in it of the Apollo program. The justifications total so many pages that if any of us sat down to read them it would take us all day just to read them. Included in these justifications is procurement of Apollo hardware not to be delivered for years and years to come to the level of hundreds of millions of dollars, and yet it is hardware we may never be able to use if the Gemini program does not work. Since we are not in a race to the moon for survival and since we are short of funds, we ought to wait and see the results of the Gemini program before we commit all of these thousands of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money for things we may never be able to use. You know, the Apollo program contemplates a capsule in lunar orbit around the moon, then a breakoff from the capsule and going down to the surface of the moon, spending a few hours there, returning to the capsule in orbit around the moon, then turning the capsule toward earth and coming home. Considering the obstacles and the degree of scientific proficiency required for all this, it is an extremely ambitious program indeed.

In the Appendix to the RECORD today I have included in full my separate views contained in the committee report.

It has been said, that project Mercury where we have had six successful flights was like threading a needle in the sky. With all due respect to the great accumulation of technical expertise which is gathered in NASA, project Gemini is many times more difficult than threading the Mercury needle in the sky. I, for one, have serious reservations about whether it is going to work as easily or as successfully as it is claimed it is going to work. There are going to be flights later on this year. There are going to be a series of flights. These flights will determine whether we can rendezvous in space and whether our spacecraft are of the right type. Money is in this bill for these Gemini flights and nobody is begrudging it. There is no objection to it so far as I know. However, what many concerned citizens do object to is appropriating hundreds of millions for long leadtime contracts for buying hardware in the Apollo program that we may not be able to use at all if Gemini does not work out.

There is authorized and appropriated in this bill more than $4 billion for research and development. Look at page 44 and 45 of the bill. You will find there is a single appropriation of $4,345 million with the money to remain available until expended. This single research and development appropriation is for everything in the NASA program without any instruction or enjoinder upon the administrator as to how it is to be spent or what it is to be spent for except for the general classifications set out in seven lines of the section.

If you look at the estimates for the fiscal year 1965 in volume I, page 2, and volume II, pages RD 2 to 7, you will find $2,677,500,000 for the Apollo program out of the $4,345 million of R. & D. funds. In this there is almost a billion dollars for spacecraft alone, $520 million for so-called command and service modules, $190 million for a lunar excursion module, $145 million for spacecraft support, and so on.

This is a vast program. There are many lobbyists and many interested parties in and out of Washington. NASA itself prints all kinds of descriptions and justifications and glamorous items about landing on the moon and other fascinating aspects of its work that perhaps make more sense in space. But the fact of the matter is we have not even been able to make a soft landing on the moon of instruments yet. We are not even sure that what NASA is projecting, we are going to be able to do at all. Yet, the Congress is now asked for $5,200 million more. We have spent $12 billion in the program. With this $5 billion more we will be but half way toward the projected minimum cost of $34 billion—hearings, page 948. This is a lot of money. We should hold up and make sure we are on the right road. This is not to object to such things as communications satellites, or weather eyes, or instrument landings on the moon. But the development of legitimate and proper interests of this country in space is a far cry from certain unrealities of the moonshot program. There is no objection to the proper liaison with the military to perfect a role in space that will keep us at the proper level with the Soviet Union so far as security in space is concerned.

But there must be some objection somewhere to buying hardware for the Apollo program before we have proof tested Gemini's rendezvous. And perhaps even more important, even if astronauts are able to get to the moon there are substantial indications that perhaps a man cannot live in weightless space very long. We do not know. There are difficulties. It is a terrific strain on the heart when there is a return to the atmosphere. In questioning of Mr. Webb in the hearings before us, the testimony was that it is going to take 2½ days, at least, to go to the moon, and 2½ days to come back from the moon, and after some time on the moon this means that a person is going to be in a state of weightlessness where the heart works differently in such a state of weightlessness than it does on earth and in the earth's atmosphere for almost a week. There is a real question whether the human animal can survive such a change. We cannot atmospherize these capsules. So you can see there are problems raised here which may be insurmountable for man. This is something that we hope that science and medical science will be able to answer before we kill an astronaut by making him a guinea pig. But regardless of

this possible roadblock it is undeniable that unless we can rendezvous and dock in space we are going to be unable to use the Apollo spacecraft or lunar excursion module at all. So here we should hold up until Gemini is completed. There is no hurry except for the understandable enthusiasm of the space advocates.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. I note that my distinguished friend from New Hampshire indicated that we are not in a race and apparently we are not in any particular rivalry with the Soviet Union in any way in space.

I should like to point out that the Soviet Union is still considerably ahead of the United States in three areas—in the area of big booster capability, in the area of exact precise timing in getting a vehicle off, and in the area of rendezvous. They have accomplished a great deal more in these areas than we have, and all of them involve military possibilities.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will excuse it, I must comment; because, as he knows, my time is very limited—which is one of the difficulties under which we all labor—my suggestion or implication was not that we are not in a space contest with the Soviet Union but that we are not in a race to the moon with the Soviet Union.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WYMAN. I cannot yield further at this time. I will yield in a moment, if I have time.

While the Soviet Union has established a certain degree of superiority in the sense of cosmonauts coming closer together in space, they have never actually rendezvoused in space. Neither have we.

This is an extremely costly business. I suggest to the gentleman from California that we should not go ahead now with such long leadtime procurement, so that we can make certain that when and as we go ahead we will do so in the right direction and finally accomplish what we wish.

As is indicated and set forth in the separate views that were filed and that are now before you, we ought to get rid of the 1970 target date, because the 1970 target date will be all well and good, if we meet it and if we put a man on the moon by 1970, but if we do not, then we shall have just set up another strawman that turns out to be a man of steel, and we shall lose more prestige, an entirely unnecessary loss. The 1970 target date is just another gimmick to keep up pressures for added crash space spending.

As the gentleman knows, my quarrel with the whole situation here relates to the principal reason we appear to be in this moonshot venture which is prestige. There is no national security council advisory or anybody of authority in the security field who tells us we have to get a man on the moon before the Russians so that we can be safe on earth. We do not know whether the Communist space program even targets a manned moon landing. This is terribly expensive business and this the Communists know well. They want us to spend billions on scientific junkets while they stay close to earth.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman must realize what the Russians have achieved recently in their program. The gentleman said they had not achieved a rendezvous. The rendezvous takes many steps. The Soviet Union has come considerably closer to realizing a rendezvous technique than have we. The very fact that they came within 1 mile or so of each other is an indication of an ability to maneuver vehicles, so that possibly, in the next step, they can rendezvous.

Further than that, there is a position of precise timing involved in the exercise. At a particular time one vehicle is sent up. At another particular time another vehicle leaves the ground, without a delay in the countdown or a waitover for the next day or anything. They send the vehicle up, with a particular velocity, and they come within a very close area of rendezvous. This is of substantial military benefit in respect to the rendezvous technique itself.

Also, there is the fact that the big boosters give an ability to a country to place large payloads in orbit.

Mr. WYMAN. I recognize the inevitable need for the big boosters. I know that we have to go along with Saturn, because of the need to be able to put substantial loads into space. I hope that we can develop small nuclear explosions as a means of doing it less expensively and less cumbersomely.

At the same time, we have no business in procuring a lunar excursion nodule until we know that we can use the nodule to go down to the surface of the moon. This is what a lot of money in this appropriation is for.

The situation here involved is one in which, if we were members of the board of directors of a private corporation, we would lose our jobs by spending company money for the procurement at this time for equipment for this kind of program, before we know it will work. This money will go down the drain, unless we find out we can rendezvous in space. Whether the two Russians came close to each other or not, there is all the difference in the world between coming close to one another and transferring a pilot from one capsule to another in space or from a capsule to the moon and back to earth.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. I suppose the gentleman has heard recently—if he has, he is one of the few who have, however—about what came to the attention of the members of the Public Works Subcommittee. As the gentleman knows, the Atomic Energy Commission comes under the jurisdiction, dollarwise, of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. We learned that the proposed landing on the moon was only the beginning; that after we landed a man or two on the moon, if they ever get there, we are then supposed to enter into a program of exploring all the planets in the heavens and elsewhere around the great universe, which program will carry on for the next 18 years.

Now, of course, nobody yet has even attempted to estimate the cost of that program, but it is a proposition that has been dreamed up by those who constantly dream up things. Without a doubt that dream will be publicized very soon, at least after the Public Works Appropriation Committee bill comes to the floor of the House. It is really fantastic in its proportions, and I hope that the American people will not fall for that kind of a gimmick.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the gentleman. In this appropriation is $23 million for planning where to go beyond the moon. Mr. Chairman, in this figure of $4.345 billion that has been approved by a majority of our subcommittee and that is before the House, at page RD 2–2 of the justifications there is $945 million for spacecraft in fiscal year 1965, to say nothing of some $1.8 billion for the engines. I do not seek to reduce funds for engine procurement. Yet we should recognize that these engines, while beautiful things, are gone once you have made a single launch, because they do not come back—each one of these Saturn shots here costs $100 million a shot. We could have a lot of heart disease and cancer research, oceanography, and a lot of other things done on earth that relate more to life on earth with that amount of money. Some restraints in haste in space spending are now in order for us.

Also included in this is $209 million for fiscal year 1965 in Apollo support alone. So when we spend for a lunar excursion module $189 million and are going on with mockups on this, it is plain foolish until we know whether this will work or not. We should defer the long leadtime procurement and get rid of the 1970 target date. Even if we have to do it by legislative action this country should say we will go to the moon when and as our time and money will permit it. We can continue with the other important aspects of our other space programs, but we should not buy hardware for a rendezvous capability until we know we have established the capability in our Gemini program. This will be established or fail within fiscal year 1965 so what I am talking about is not indefinite postponement.

Finally, I feel I must comment on something that my colleague from New York said yesterday in the RECORD about the Electronics Research Center. He made reference to the fact that he had been denied by NASA access to certain engineering studies. I want to say that at my request the chairman of the NASA electronics research center site selection committee came to my office this Tuesday with this material. Previous to this I sent my colleague from New York a letter notifying him that he could be there if he wished to and that these reports he wanted to see would be there for his examination. The reports were there and they were available to him

for his inspection. He did not choose to come to see them. I have to say this because I think it is important that this should be known so that my colleagues would not get the impression there has been, at least so far as the Appropriations Committee has been concerned, the sanction of any suppression of knowledge from a colleague, particularly a colleague on the authorizing committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. The purpose was to let Mr. WYDLER have this information and look it over. Of course, this is an important subject and relates to a NASA construction commitment that is of major significance. No agency of the Government subject to review by Congress should deny its files to a Member of either the authorizing or Appriations Committee. I shall offer an amendment to line 4 on page 45 of the bill to change the procurement figure from $4.345 billion to $3.5 billion, with a requirement that the reduction shall be applied to the long leadtime of Apollo follow-on procurement items. At that time I hope to be able to spell out more clearly exactly which items we should hold up on until such time as we know the Gemini program is going to work. Someday soon I hope that there can be some added responsibility exercised here to hold up on space spending in unproven horizons. The U.S. Treasury is not a bottomless pit and we must establish some priorities in spending. Nearly $1 billion saved here by holding up for a year on Apollo spacecraft procurement will not hurt the program. With all due respect to other Members of this House none can know or say definitely to the contrary because we do not know Gemini is going to work no matter how confident of success we may be. This check is a responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations together with the authorizing committee.

At the appropriate time I shall offer the following amendment to the NASA research and development section, page 45:

Strike out all of line 4, page 45 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$3,500,000,000 to remain available until expended. *Provided, however,* That the reduction in this appropriation shall apply to the Apollo spacecraft procurement program."

I hope that serious consideration will be given to exercising some responsibility by putting on the brakes on this procurement because I detect around the country a very firm feeling on the part of most Americans that this moon business is something we ought to go pretty easy on, anyway at least until we are surer of each step along this glamorous pathway to the stars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] may extend his remarks at this point on this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat astonished when I read in the committee report on the independent offices appropriations bill the following statement:

The entire fallout shelter program is under study and review by the Department of Defense at the present time and the committee recommends no additional funds for stocking shelter supplies or new programs proposed in the budget.

You may recall that on April 29, I made a statement on behalf of the subcommittee which was as follows:

It is evident from our hearings that a decision on the shelter program can be made independently of other decisions on continental defense. The fallout shelter program can stand alone and will contribute far more to the savings of lives per dollar spent than any other active defense program. It is not dependent on an antiballistic missile system for its effectiveness.

Since reading the quoted paragraph in the report, I have spoken with the Department of Defense and have been assured that the position of the Department is exactly as Deputy Secretary Cyrus Vance stated it to your committee in testifying on the appropriations being sought, and I quote a portion of his statement:

My purpose is briefly to underscore the importance of this program as an indispensable element of our national security.

Within the Defense Department, an assessment of the importance of civil defense and, in particular, of the fallout shelter program, rests upon detailed studies, the views of senior military officers, and the best judgment of Secretary McNamara and his advisers in this field. All point to civil defense as an essential ingredient of national defense. In both practical and human terms, all indicate the especial importance of a nationwide fallout shelter program.

In my view, a civil defense program with emphasis on fallout shelters is essential because:

It will save many millions of lives in the event of nuclear attack;

It will demonstrate our national will to stand fast, recover from nuclear attack, and look to the future with optimistic determination;

It will give us more flexibility in making future decisions as to weapons systems and strategy.

It will, as Mr. McNamara has said:

Contribute much more, dollar for dollar, to the saving of lives than further increases in either our strategic retaliatory or continental air and missile defense forces.

It will, in accomplishing all of the foregoing, strengthen our deterrent posture.

But just as the relationship of civil defense to military defense measures is apparent, so, too, is it clear that a nationwide program for fallout shelters is important in its own right. It will stand on its own feet. No matter what else we do, fallout shelters would save lives and give us a human springboard to national recovery from nuclear attack. No matter what future decisions are made as to defensive systems, these shelters are needed.

Secretary Vance concluded by saying:

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this program is critical to the security of the people and the military defense of the Nation. Good progress has been made, but further progress is essential. I urge your support in this.

I would like to underscore the fact that substantial progress is being made in creating a realistic and practical fallout based civil defense system. This national enterprise involves the cooperation of three levels of government, as well as business, industry and individual citizens. Progress will not continue, depending as it does upon a reasoned patriotic response to Federal leadership, if the mistaken impression remains on the record that the Defense Department is hesitant about this program. I am sure the committee did not intend any such impression.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my disappointment in the reduction by 10 percent of the amount recommended by the President in that portion of the Veterans' Administration budget for funding of hospital replacement projects and modernizations.

Twenty-four percent of this money is slated for veterans hospitals in California. The budget request included $22.6 million to build the Los Angeles Veterans Hospital. This cut would, presumably, be prorated and would take more than $2 million from this project.

California has more veterans than any State in the Union—2,134,000 as of January 1, 1964. We have more veterans of World War I than any State other than New York. Our rate of increase in population is tremendous and this general increase means more and more veterans. Los Angeles County, of course, has more than one-third of the State's population.

I do not believe that anyone would disagree with the fact that we have this tremendous growth problem and that anything that is done to alleviate the situation will only be a step in the right direction.

It is my feeling that the place to save money is not on our hospital programs. I would certainly agree with the suggestion by the Committee on Appropriations that "frills" should not be included in the plans for new hospital construction, but I fail to see how it will be possible to find $2 million in "frills" in the Los Angeles Veterans Hospital plans.

Needless to say, necessities will suffer. In fact, there are necessities that have not been included in the original planning, and the possibility of gaining inclusion of items that should have been included grows more remote. This will be a major blow to the quality of the Los Angeles facility.

On a recent trip to Long Beach Veterans Hospital I was greatly impressed by the work that is being done in the rehabiliation of paraplegics and by the spirit of the patients. I was disappointed by the results of false economy, where unnecessary delays are encountered before operations can be performed because of inadequate facilities and staff. This necessitates, at times, the housing

and care of the patients for unnecessarily long periods of time prior to treatment which, in the long run, costs the Veterans' Administration additional funds that could have been saved if facilities and personnel had been available.

Nursing home type care and beds are becoming increasingly in demand and this demand will continue increasing at a faster rate each year. We are not fulfilling the obligations we have properly undertaken to care for our veterans of past wars at the time when their need is the greatest—when they are in poor health and in their declining years.

I do not plan to offer an amendment to restore this cut, which I feel should not have been made, but it is my fervent hope that the funds can be restored by the other body and that the conference committee will see fit to accept any revisions upward that might be forthcoming. It is unfortunate that more time was not allowed between the receipt of the committee's report and today's action on the floor. There has not been an opportunity to determine the general sentiment of the Members, which I feel would be generally in agreement with my sentiments as I have just expressed them.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my deep concern about the 10-percent reduction made in the President's budget recommendations for funds for replacement and modernization of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities.

These funds include amounts earmarked for the new Los Angeles Veterans' Administration Hospital scheduled to be built in Hazard Park in my 30th Congressional District.

The amount requested by the President in January was $22,628,000 to construct this urgently needed 1,040-bed facility. A 10-percent cut would involve over $2 million and could severely restrict essential portions of the project.

As you know, California now has more veterans than any other State in the Union—over 2,100,000—and our rapidly increasing population brings more and more veterans into the State each year.

The problem is particularly acute in the Los Angeles metropolitan area with over one-third of the State's population living there.

No one can doubt the great need for this new veterans hospital. For this reason, I was greatly disturbed to learn from this week's committee report that the 10-percent reduction was recommended.

In my opinion, we can find much better places to save money and reduce Government spending than in our veterans hospital programs. There are definitely no frills or extravagant expenditures included in the plans for the new Los Angeles hospital. In fact, it is my understanding that several desirable features were not included in the original plans, and it has been my hope that they could be provided for in future year appropriations.

We dare not forget for a minute the real moral and legal obligation we have assumed to care for the needs of veterans of our past wars. This obligation is particularly heavy in the case of our older veterans whose health is declining.

So it would be my hope that, before this bill is approved in final form for the President's signature, that most if not all, of this 10-percent cut will have been restored, and that any remaining reduction in appropriations will not adversely affect the essential construction requirements of our veterans hospital program.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, one of our colleagues here today will not be with us in future Congresses. He is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations on the Republican side—the Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG. His retirement from Congress will be a great loss to the Nation. It will be a particularly significant loss to the Committee on Appropriations, for he has been a tower of strength in the work done by that committee. Few people other than those who serve on the committee realize the exacting schedule required of its members. Day after day we must take time away from the work of our districts and from the requirements of our office schedules for exhaustive and lengthy hearings on the fiscal requirements of the departments of Government. In this difficult work, no one has contributed more than the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

I have never thought of him as Democrat or Republican. He is first of all a dedicated American. In his work in Congress, he seeks constantly the advancement of our country and the enhancement of the standing and the reputation of the Congress.

I have worked more closely with him than most, for we serve together on the Subcommittee on Defense. As I think back through the long years we have worked together, I can name no one who has helped more to preserve the integrity of our committee or who has done more to make our Nation the great force that it is.

I honor and respect HAROLD OSTERTAG. I shall miss him very much. I shall regret the loss of his counsel very much. But let me be among the first to say that he has earned the pleasures and benefits of retirement, and I wish him and his wonderful helpmate, Mrs. Ostertag, Godspeed in all they undertake in the years to come. He is truly an outstanding, a great American.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, while I support the bill before us today, my purpose in speaking is to comment briefly on one of our colleagues who had much to do with the committee consideration of this bill and others like it through the years. That colleague, HAROLD OSTERTAG, is the ranking minority member on the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

As we all know, HAROLD will retire from these Chambers after this session of the 88th Congress. While we respect his judgment and decision to step down, it is with extreme regret that we note his imminent departure.

Gentlemen from both sides of the aisle are aware of the dedicated work performed by HAROLD OSTERTAG both in committee assignments and on this floor. He is one of the best liked persons in this body and is highly respected for his knowledge and understanding of the many problems that come before us.

It is my privilege to sit with him on the Appropriations Committee, and I have benefited from his example and advice.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of us are united in wishing our colleague a most fruitful and enjoyable retirement. We can be sure that his service to his district, State, and Nation will not end with the closing of this session. He has devoted a lifetime to serving his fellow man and HAROLD OSTERTAG will always find time for such service wherever he goes.

It is an honor to be a friend of his and it is my wish that we will have many opportunities to benefit from his wisdom in the years ahead.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11296 and wish to speak especially about the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which is a part of this bill.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I support the space activities of this Nation wholeheartedly and without reservation.

There is no more important undertaking, on the part of this Nation, than the space program of the United States. It is my firm conviction that the first nation to fully conquer this frontier of our generation and our time will truly lead the nations of this globe.

I am gratified to learn that the Appropriations Committee is recommending to the House a bill which continues the all-important programs of NASA at a level of spending equal to last year's, and which approves and confirms the work this year of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, on which I have the privilege of serving. This Committee recommended to the House an authorization of similar amount.

It is absolutely essential to this Nation to be first in space. By first, I mean that the United States should be preeminent in this activity among the nations of the world.

There are many reasons why this is important. First comes to mind the national security of this Nation. No one knows exactly what shape the military role in space will take by this or other nations. But it is significant that the present space program of this Nation and Russia grew out of the ballistic missile activities of the two nations. Engines, boosters, and the science and technology that goes into our peaceful and our military space programs are similar, overlapping, and inextricably interwoven. The one compliments the other. Moreover, over the years, knowledge and skills in activities at first wholly peaceful later become important militarily. No more dramatic example of this can be cited than the invention of the Wright brothers. The airplane, at first considered to be a sort of freak invention, later became a military weapon of great importance and a decisive factor in World War II.

All reasonable men fervently desire that space may be used for peaceful rather than warlike purposes. But the

political forces contending in the world today make it plainly evident that the surest way to maintain the peace is through strength. It is imperative that the United States, the leader and bulwark of the West and the free world, became preeminent in space. Military activities of the future are destined to be conducted in space.

The acquisition of scientific knowledge is of great importance in this program. Space achievements of this Nation are rapidly increasing our knowledge, about our home planet the earth, the solar system, and the universe beyond. It cannot be doubted that we are on the threshold of great new discoveries here.

The NASA budget of this year provides moneys for this important and ever growing program.

Space activities of this Nation include the great strides we are making in communications. Certainly one of the surest ways of better understanding of each other by the nations of the world is through improved communications. It is only a question of time before the whole world will be connected by satellite communication systems. It cannot be doubted that such a network will help promote better relations among nations.

Then, too, in the field of weather reconnaisance our space program has made new breakthroughs. Here we can look forward to the day when the world will no longer be caught unprepared by weather surprises, the great tropical storms that have caused tremendous damage, suffering and loss of human life in the past.

Of great significance in the space effort of the Nation is the reservoir of knowledge and of trained scientists and beginners which the Nation is rapidly building up. This resource will prove of incalculable benefit to the Nation as the years go on.

Lastly, I think it is of vital importance to men and a nation to have a challenge to face and to meet and overcome. In the past history of our planet, exploration has been one of the great challenges. There is little left to be explored on this globe now. Shrunk it has in size indeed with modern tools of transportation and communication.

While there are still some unexplored portions of our earth, there are none which are not open to man should he desire to go there. Space, the solar system and the universe beyond are the frontiers to be explored today. They constitute the great challenge to men and nations, of our day. I do not doubt that meeting this challenge will benefit this Nation in ways far beyond our comprehension today.

The activities and the spending proposed for the next fiscal year of NASA have been gone over at great length by both the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Appropriations Committee. It is most significant that the two committees are in close agreement. The bill is a sound one, and I urge its support by my colleagues.

I cannot urge this House of Representatives more earnestly or fervently to support this year's appropriations for NASA, in this bill, to the end that our great Nation will continue its strong space program, while it will permit us to gain preeminence and world leadership in these frontiers of today and tomorrow.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I support the Harris amendment to stop the FAA from closing flight service stations. We should be taking steps to increase safety, not cut corners with safety. The FAA should be adding dozens of new sources of weather readings, not cutting them back.

In my State, Minnesota, we have already had the bitter experience of the FAA closing the flight service station at Grantsburg, Wis., a few years ago. The FAA argued that removing the communications and weather specialists would save the taxpayer's money and that weather information would be provided in some other way.

As a result, today the 140-mile route between Duluth and Minneapolis has no weather facility at all. Many people have died in light plane accidents caused by weather along that route since Grantsburg FSS was closed.

General aviation is very important to my State and my city. Business flying helps industrial development and expansion. Recreational flying to Minnesota's fishing and hunting and vacation areas is increasingly important. This growing industry should be encouraged and promoted and made safer.

The FAA is trying to fly backward when it cuts back on safety services to general aviation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13:

"CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

"For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, $4,190,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLARENCE CANNON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, in the history of our Nation, few Members have left a greater imprint upon the House of Representatives than the man whose memory we honor today, our beloved, late colleague, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON.

His service in the House covered one of the most important periods in American history. In those years, our Nation and the Congress have faced the most critical problems and CLARENCE CANNON had a large part in their solution.

His career was typically American. The late Speaker, Champ Clark, persuaded him to come to Washington to work as a clerk in the Speaker's office in 1911. A few years later, he was elected House Parliamentarian and held that office under both Democratic and Republican administrations, until he was elected to the House in 1922. He never lost a subsequent election, and generally led every other national and State candidate on the ballot.

He was one of the world's leading authorities on parliamentary procedure and Members of this House, for generations to come, will be the beneficiaries of the legacy of parliamentary law he left us.

But this was not the only sphere of CLARENCE CANNON's influence in the House. During his service as chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations it is estimated that he presided over appropriation bills totaling more than a trillion dollars. He had a profound knowledge of the fiscal problems of our great country and year after year he meticulously studied and examined practically every detail of the entire Federal budget. All of us know how he fought waste and extravagance and his effectiveness in these fields.

The people of the Ninth Congressional District of Missouri knew CLARENCE CANNON as a great and powerful man but they also knew him as a friend. People of high and low esteem loved and respected him. His personal correspondence was among the heaviest of any Member of the House. Through the years, thousands came to him with their problems, their hopes and their fears. No request was too small or unimportant. He never turned a single one away. In his home district, his name is legend. He faithfully served the people he represented and they will long remember him, not only as an outstanding Congressman, but as a friend.

It was my privilege to know CLARENCE CANNON for almost 30 years and a kind of special bond always existed between us because we both began our service in Washington as employees of the House. I shall never forget his many kindnesses to me. He was a true friend and I am grateful for our long friendship.

His passing is a matter of sadness not only to those of us who served with him, but also to his devoted wife, his family, and his host of friends. Perhaps our feelings on this occasion can best be summed up in the lines of the Poet Laureate Mattie Richards Tyler, who is Mrs. Cannon's good friend:

The shadows touch his desk and empty chair—
No parliamentary problems now for him,
No budgets to be cut with stubborn care
By creed of thrift, unshakable and grim.
For many years he waged a gallant fight
Against the ravages of waste and greed;
He matched his strength with forces of great might,
And rose in power to his Nation's need.

Our Government by law instead of men
Is more secure because of him
His work will long endure. His record stands—
He, who served so brilliantly and long,
Now leaves his torch to other outstretched hands.
God grant those hands—like his—be firm and strong:
His colleagues file in silence to their places,
Respect and loss reflected in their faces.

(Mr. KARSTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of our beloved colleague.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the memory of a great man. Few men in history have had the opportunity of participating for more than a half century in the political life of the Nation's Capitol, and still fewer men are permitted the opportunity to serve in this House for more than 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to attempt to elaborate upon the statements that have been made by the dean of our Missouri congressional delegation [Mr. KARSTEN], but it is doubtful if Mr. CANNON's record, or records I should say, will ever be equaled. To me it is a paradox that the man who as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was responsible for bringing to this floor appropriation bills totaling more than a trillion dollars, who also in my opinion was responsible for saving the taxpayers of this Nation more billions of dollars than any other individual.

Mr. Speaker, in many other respects he was a paradoxical figure, a man of many facets, maligned on many occasions, but praised more often; a man who could be tough and hard as steel when the occasion demanded, yet as kindly a person as I have ever known. His counsel and advice have been most helpful to me over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I had known Mr. CANNON, by reputation, long before I came to Congress. But it was after I had been here for a few years before I began to enjoy the intimate association that will forever be cherished in my memories. Mr. CANNON, despite the great power and influence which he held as a result of his position, never failed to reflect the humbleness and the devotion which had endeared him to his constituency throughout the more than 40 years he served his people. His interest in, and leadership in agricultural legislation, will be reflected for many years. No man has been of more help in advancement of the REA program than Mr. CANNON.

Mr. Speaker, many of us were worried because of the apparent decline in his physical stamina, but never during any time did I ever hear him complain of an ache or a pain. It was difficult for any of us to realize that he had reached the age of 85, for he was not only agile in body until recently, but young in mind.

I recall very vividly an occasion on the Friday before his death when he attended a breakfast sponsored by the Missouri Automobile Club, at which were present some half-dozen young men from his district, each of whom received from him one of the shiny new dollars that he presented with an intimate talk which I know has left a lasting impression on the thousands of young people to whom he had made a similar presentation over the years.

Mr. Speaker, no tribute to our departed friend would be complete without a reference to the family relationship which existed throughout all of the years Mr. CANNON served the people of his community, State, and Nation. One of the greatest pleasures which has come from my service in the Congress has been the privilege I have enjoyed of knowing Mrs. Cannon, "Miss Ida" to the tens of thousands of people of the Ninth District and the many friends they have made in the Washington community. Never in my experience have I observed a more gracious lady, one who is not only interested in the constituency which she and her husband served, but one who gave her talents and her energy, who was not only beloved and held in the highest esteem but who was truly a part of the team that rendered such a dedicated service. No one recognized and appreciated her worth and value more than the dedicated husband, father, and grandfather whose memory we eulogize here today.

One other thing I would like to say is that, contrary to what I think many people might have felt about Mr. CANNON, during the 15 years I have served here as a member of the Missouri delegation, despite his great wisdom, and the fact that for many years he was the dean of the delegation, he never at any time tried to influence me in my vote on any question. He always felt you are here to represent your people, and he emphasized the fact that one's first duty was to the constituency of the Member.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I would like to read an editorial which appears in the Wednesday, May 13, issue of the Daily Dunklin Democrat, of Kenneth, Mo., written by the editor, Mr. Jack Stapleton, Jr., entitled "A Man of Principles" which I believe is indicative of the high esteem in which this great American was held, not only throughout the State of Missouri, but in other parts of this Nation, where his service and dedication have been appreciated throughout the years:

A MAN OF PRINCIPLES

The death of Missourian CLARENCE CANNON leaves a void in this State as well as in the U.S. House of Representatives, where the senior Member of the Missouri congressional delegation served so ably.

The 85-year-old Missouri congressman had a long and distinguished career, serving not only the citizens of his own district but the citizens of every congressional district in the Nation.

As President Johnson noted yesterday, CLARENCE CANNON had a varied public career. His knowledge of, and his contribution toward, the rules of parliamentary procedure were unique in the annals of the Congress. No man in the history of government has contributed so much toward the establishment of parliamentary procedure in the legislative process.

To many Americans, the absence of CLARENCE CANNON from the parliamentarian's chair in the next Democratic National Convention will make the party gathering something less than official.

Beyond this, however, is a far greater contribution which CLARENCE CANNON made, not only to this State but to the Nation. His chairmanship of the important and budget-sensitive House Appropriations Committee gave him almost singlehanded control over every appropriation made by the Congress.

The job was staggering, and undoubtedly, its responsibilities took their toll on Representative CANNON, despite his amazing efforts to keep himself informed about every bill before the House.

It is safe to say that CLARENCE CANNON, during his distinguished career in the House of Representatives, whittled more needless requests from the Nation's budget than any Congressman in the history of the Federal Government.

It is also safe to say that no American applied himself any more diligently to this responsibility than did CLARENCE CANNON. And for his conscientious efforts to protect the citizens' tax dollars, CLARENCE CANNON earned everlasting respect and appreciation from the American taxpayer.

Missourians and Americans will miss CLARENCE CANNON in the years ahead. His dedication to the principles of this State and this Nation made him such an outstanding public servant that it will be difficult to fill the void in Congress.

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, few men in American history have exercised for so long such great power as did our colleague, CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri.

He was a man of strong convictions, and he fought for his convictions effectively, skillfully, and faithfully.

It was my privilege to be associated with him on a number of projects of common interest. No man could be a better ally. If by any chance you found yourself in opposition to the gentleman from Missouri, no man could be more difficult to oppose.

My heart goes out to his wife, one of the most charming and sweetest ladies of all those I have ever known.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

CLARENCE CANNON served in this body during World War II and after World War II, and to this very day of Communist aggression to take over the world and impose that vicious and evil ideology upon all governments and upon all peoples.

During his long and honorable service, CLARENCE CANNON always stood for the national interest of our country. In connection with legislation and appropriations having to do with the strength of America to meet any enemy, actual or potential, we always found CLARENCE CANNON in committee and in the well of this House fighting for such legislation and appropriations that would assure not only the preservation of our country for ourselves, but for future generations of Americans; and at the same time he always stood for and fought for such legislation that would be a warning to any enemy, actual or potential, that America would be prepared.

On the domestic side he fought for progressive measures particularly in the field of agriculture and he was a leader in strengthening the agricultural life and community of America, to which I can testify, coming from a city district which does not have one farm, and I have consistently supported such legislation during my own years of service in this body.

CLARENCE CANNON represented the spirit of America. He was born of the soil. His thoughts were always connected with the soil of America. His life was somewhat like a Horatio Alger story. In addition to being an inspiration for all Americans to follow and for all good persons everywhere to follow, his life was particularly an inspiration for the youth of America—these youngsters whom we see in the galleries of this Chamber—these youngsters who come to the Capitol. When I see them, I see all young Americans in all places—in all the homes and streets of our cities as well as in the rural areas throughout the country. They are the future leaders of our country. They are the ones to whom we must look in the future to take over the reins of Government when those like ourselves and others with responsibility have passed on.

CLARENCE CANNON always had that in mind, always trying to be an inspiration for the youth of America. His dedicated years of service in this body are historical in that respect.

If CLARENCE could speak to us from the great beyond today, I know he would express his pleasure at the depth of feeling that every one of us is experiencing and expressing because of his passing on. And particularly for the beautiful remarks made about that dear sweetheart and wife of his, Mrs. Cannon.

As the poet said:

It is in the arms of a woman we enter life.
In the arms of a woman we gain courage and strength to bear life,
It is in the arms of a woman we leave life.
And as for the span between,
How meaningless it would be without her.
And "her" means mother and wife.

We all know Mrs. Cannon was the constant guide and adviser of this great American.

He recognized her wisdom and the soundness of her views. But more than that, the closeness of their married life through the years they were married was always an inspiration, and will always be an inspiration, for other married couples to follow.

So we miss CLARENCE CANNON. He was an integral part of the House. As two or three of my colleagues well said, he loved the House of Representatives. That is true. I can understand, because I love this body. He loved this great Chamber, which I consider to be the greatest legislative body in the world, bar none.

The collective judgment of this body is sound. We may have our differences, but everyone here is a dedicated American and a dedicated legislator, and the collective judgment of the House—we may not always agree with it—is sound and for the best interests of our country.

CLARENCE CANNON throughout the years played an important part, an outstanding part, in the determination of the collective judgment of the House of Representatives.

I had an intense feeling of respect and admiration, and a strong feeling of friendship, for him.

My friendships are entirely different from political views. I separate in my mind my friendships from political views or differences on public questions. I admired CLARENCE CANNON very much and entertained for him, as I said, the strongest feeling of friendship possible. I shall miss him very much, as will all my colleagues.

He was a bulwark of strength through the long years he served in this body, rendering honorable and trustworthy service.

So I make these remarks, as my other colleagues did, most regretfully on the passing of a dear friend, a great American, an outstanding colleague. I extend to that sweetheart of his throughout their long married life, Mrs. Cannon, and to her loved ones my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a Washington newspaper said today editorially:

> The forces in Maryland that favor a sane, reasonable and constitutional settlement of civil rights issues have won a significant victory in the face of great odds.

That statement represents one of the worst beatings ever administered to the right of freedom of speech. There just is not a word of truth in it. Any one who has mastered the first page of the political primer knows that an outsider running against a favorite son always has the odds against him. Instead of having great odds in his favor, Governor Wallace was confronted with the most formidable lineup of opposition that could be assembled in a single State. The political parties, the Negro organizations, the liberal organizations, labor, even the churches opposed him. The President and the brother of a martyred President visited Maryland to show their support for the favorite son ticket. Despite this lineup, it is an undenied and undeniable fact that Governor Wallace was defeated only by the Negro bloc vote. That means he got a majority in all other groups. It is not a victory to be proud of.

Reams of explanation will not change the fact that the people are seriously disturbed by efforts to enact into law a civil rights bill which will establish the framework for a police state and the set-aside of the American Constitution.

The tide of civil rights support is beginning to recede. The majority do not want this iniquitous bill. They know there is no need and little honest demand for it. Now, they are demanding that the rights of the majority also be considered and the voice of the majority heard. Theirs will be the last word.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Compensation of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCHOOL PRAYER OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on School Prayer of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WILL OBSOLETE AIRCRAFT WIN THE WAR IN VIETNAM?

(Mr. GUBSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, there is every justification for the current wave of public indignation over asking officers of the U.S. Air Force to serve this, the richest Nation on earth, by facing death in obsolete and wornout aircraft. The American people have a right to the full truth and there is reason to believe that they are not getting it.

Just a few hours ago I learned from a reliable source that the A–1E aircraft which are en route to Vietnam at this moment to replace the obsolete and wornout B–26 and T–28's were taken from Litchfield Park, a boneyard airfield in Arizona. It might be pointed out that the last A–1E was built by the Douglas Aircraft Co. in 1953. So these planes which are supposed to replace obsolete equipment are a minimum of 11 years old themselves. We have no assurance that metal fatigue has not set in and that these aircraft might be just different death traps.

I shall ask Secretary McNamara to furnish the exact log, age, and history of every aircraft being sent to Vietnam. The American people have a right to the full truth and assurance that officers of the U.S. Air Force will not again be required to face death in obsolete and wornout aircraft.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11296, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through line 19, page 3, of the bill. If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read at this point and that all points of order not heretofore covered in the bill may be saved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, at this hour in the afternoon I would have to object to that. Let us proceed with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and Technology, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $880,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the very able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee with respect to the amount of money recommended in this bill for airline subsidies. I observe that $79 million has been recommended for subsidy payments to air carriers. If I am not mistaken, I think this is exactly the same amount that was provided in last year's legislation but some $3,824,000 less than had been contained in the budget estimate. As usual, the chairman and this great subcommittee have done a magnificient job of finding those places where substantial economies can be effected in the operation of our Government without curtailing the services of the Government. I should simply like to ask the chairman whether or not this reduction below the Presidentally requested amount would mean any curtailment in local service carrier operations and services.

Mr. THOMAS. I would be delighted to reply to the very intelligent question of our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]. As he knows, because he is an expert in this, and he certainly studies it, and we want to commend him for it, there is a reduction of about $3 million, from $82.8 million to $79 million. Of course, whatever amount of money the Civil Aeronautics Board says is due a particular carrier, or all of them together, that is the amount they are going to get. That is a debt against the United States. Of course there is that magic formula, honest, efficient, and economical management; but what we are trying to do is say to the carrier, "You do your business economically and whatever is necessary you will get." This committee will recommend such sum to the House and it will be provided.

May I point out to my colleague one other thing. First, I repeat that whatever amount of money is necessary they are going to get. I think this amount is going to cover it. If it does not we will certainly come in with sufficient money to cover it.

There is in here for the first time a subsidy for one of the big airlines of $3,750,000. Of course, this budget was prepared some 5 or 6 months ago, and in the last 4 or 5 months, as we all know, the aviation industry entered into one of its greatest periods of prosperty. We hope that will continue, and it could well be that this amount in the bill is more than they need. But, to answer the gentleman's question directly, whatever the Board says they are entitled to, they will get.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his very straightforward and lucid answer.

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, since this bill provides $79 million for subsidy payments to the Nation's air carriers, I think it would be appropriate for us to think together for a few minutes on the vital services that our airlines provide to our country.

I speak not only of the major trunk carriers, but of the local service airlines which serve smaller communities and make it possible for practically all Americans to avail themselves of the swift and safe trunk flights which operate from our metropolitan areas.

Without these local service carriers, it would be impossible for untold millions of our citizens to make connections with the sleek and speedy jets which whisk us from coast to coast in a matter of hours.

In essence these local service carriers are the veins which funnel the lifeblood of passengers and freight into the main arteries of our Nation's commerce.

This is a tremendously important job, and the local service carriers do it well.

Among the local service airlines you will find some of the greatest success stories in our great free enterprise system. In my own district, for example, is headquartered Central Airlines. Its story is truly remarkable.

Founded almost singlehandedly by my good friend, Keith Kahle, Central began operations in September 1949. During that first month of operations, using single-engine Beechcraft Bonanzas, Central carried a total of only 54 passengers Keith laughingly recalls today that the passenger total might not have been so high if he had not been able to sell tickets to so many of his relatives.

But Keith did not give up. He realized he was providing a service that was desperately needed, and the public soon began to recognize this, too. As a result, Central began to grow. And today, 15 years later, it is still growing.

This month Central is expecting to carry 36,000 passengers. The company has a total of 781 employees, and serves 42 cities in 6 States—Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Colorado. On air routes where little Bonanzas once flew, today there fly comfortable Convair liners, and of course there still are many DC–3's.

The DC–3's have long been regarded as the old reliable workhorses of the airways. Even though they are among the safest and most reliable ships in the sky today, the local service airlines are extremely conscious of the fact that these gallant old planes soon will have to be replaced with faster, more modern aircraft. They are anxious to see the development of a suitable replacement, and believe that the Government should take an active role in spurring this project.

Since the subsidies contained in this bill represent a very large amount of taxpayers' money, it is fair to ask ourselves what the local service carriers are doing to reduce the amount of subsidies they require. I am happy to report there are positive answers to this question. Let me give you one concrete example.

Thirteen local service airlines—including some Alaskan carriers and one from the Caribbean—recently banded together in an effort to cut costs by making joint purchases of common supplies. For instance, all airlines use large quantities of teletype paper. This new group will obtain this paper directly from the manufacturer, rather than through more costly retail channels.

This group is known as Capco—Consolidate Airline Purchasing Corp. It opened an office in Washington on the first of this month. Keith Kahle, who originated the idea, is serving as its $1-a-year president, in addition to his regular duties as vice chairman of the board

of directors of Central. Keith told me about the plan to demonstrate how local service carriers are making a conscientious effort to reduce operating costs. I think such efforts deserve our attention.

I should like to commend the chairman and this subcommittee for their continuing interest in this vital function of our growing country and our expanding economy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have had many words in connection with this bill but not too much light on some aspects of it during the general debate so far. This bill calls for the spending of some $13,318 million in the next fiscal year. This is an increase, according to the report, of more than $90 million over the amount spent for the same general purposes last year. Oh, sure—there is a reduction from the budget request but that is really meaningless. If there is to be economy there must be reductions below the amount that was spent last year, and on that basis this bill is more than $90 million richer than it was last year.

Only yesterday the House approved the agriculture appropriation bill. It was cut $1 billion from the figure of last year. Of course, you can argue whether it means exactly what it says or not, but at least we voted for a cut of over a billion dollars from the spending of the previous year for agriculture. Yet this committee is here today with a bill calling for $90 million more than was spent for the same general purposes last year. That neither looks nor smells like economy.

I would like to ask the chairman if it is not true that in this bill, out of the $140 million for the areonautics and space setup, which was cut out of the bill last year as an economy measure, $100 million has been put back in this bill this year.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that I will give the gentleman the exact figures on Space. But, now, I go back in my memory. There is less money this year than was authorized last year. But let me point out to the gentleman what was appropriated and authorized. We will give the gentleman that information in a minute. However, the gentleman should bear in mind that in this $90 million to which the gentleman referred a moment ago, there is a pay increase involved here with which we have nothing to do other than to pay it.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a mandatory item.

Mr. GROSS. Let us deal with the Space Administration and that $100 million which is contained in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall get to it in a minute.

Mr. GROSS. This was supposed to have been an economy measure last year, but it is right back in here today.

Mr. THOMAS. Permit me to explain it to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Surely.

Mr. THOMAS. There is a mandatory increase and we cannot laugh it off. There is an increase in here for payment of pensions to veterans that was not contained in the bill last year. That represents a minor increase, and I know that my friend is not complaining about that.

Now permit me to give the gentleman the exact figures on the Space item. When we get through, the gentleman will find that there is perhaps a little reduction.

Mr. GROSS. I am looking for information about this increase which I would like to have gotten during the general debate on the bill instead of having it taken out of my pitiful 5 minutes.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 134]

Abbitt	Elliott	Miller, N.Y.
Adair	Ellsworth	Minshall
Alger	Flynt	Morrison
Andrews, Ala.	Foreman	Mosher
Ashley	Forrester	Norblad
Ashmore	Fulton, Tenn.	Patman
Auchincloss	Gary	Pelly
Avery	Goodell	Perkins
Ayres	Grant	Pilcher
Baring	Gray	Pirnie
Barrett	Hall	Pool
Barry	Hanna	Powell
Bass	Harding	Randall
Blatnik	Hardy	Rivers, S.C.
Bolton, Frances P.	Harsha	Roberts, Ala.
	Hays	Rodino
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hébert	Roosevelt
	Herlong	Roybal
Bonner	Hoffman	St Germain
Bray	Huddleston	Scott
Brock	Ichord	Selden
Bruce	Jensen	Senner
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Short
Burton, Utah	Kee	Smith, Calif.
Chelf	Kilburn	Springer
Clawson, Del	Kilgore	Stubblefield
Cohelan	Kirwan	Sullivan
Colmer	Lankford	Teague, Calif.
Cooley	Leggett	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Lloyd	Toll
Curtis	Long, La.	Tupper
Davis, Tenn.	McIntire	Wickersham
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Dingell	Martin, Nebr.	Wilson, Charles H.
Dorn	Matsunaga	
Dowdy	May	Winstead
Edmondson	Meader	Younger

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11296, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 325 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee found itself without a quorum, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], had asked unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as I had observed before the quorum call was made, this bill calls for the spending of $13,000-plus million, which is some $90-plus million above the spending for the same general purposes last year. This compares with the agricultural appropriation bill which the House approved yesterday in which there was a cut in spending of over $1 billion below the spending for the same general purposes in the previous year. I am waiting for someone to bring in a bill, other than the Agriculture Committee, with a substantial cut in spending in it. I am afraid the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has brought us a bill that does not fit any pattern of economy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I humbly attempt to persuade my distinguished and amiable and genial friend from Iowa that this little subcommittee does fit his standard, up to a point anyway. He is right that there is about $100 million more in here than last year. There was a tremendous cut last year; do not try to take that away from us.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute now. We have the statement from you that you economized last year.

Mr. THOMAS. And you got it.

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute. You allegedly economized last year to the extent of $141 million.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, you make your statement and I will make mine.

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute, now. There is $100 million, is that right, back in this bill of the economy that you claimed to have made last year?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; of course.

Mr. THOMAS. And if the gentleman wants more time we can help him get it. The gentleman is right. There is $100 million in here. Where does it come from? Why?

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will yield further, let me answer your question. The gentleman asked the question.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the $141 million was applied to.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. GROSS. No; I am not.

Mr. THOMAS. I will tell the gentleman where it is if the gentleman wants to know. We have about $50 million in here which reflects an increase in pay, a mandatory item. That is item No. 1.

Mr. GROSS. Not in the Aeronautics and Space Administration. We went over this awhile ago. Please do not take my time trying to sell me on the idea that you have $100 million worth of salary increases in 1 year in the Space and Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. THOMAS. You go ahead and then I shall use my own time.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot accept that one on that basis. But getting back to the business of additional expenditures dealing with salary increases, how much is contained in this bill to finance the retirement fund of Federal employees and Members of Congress? How much is there in this bill for that purpose? I tried to get it straight in the hearings but could not do so.

Mr. THOMAS. It amounts to about 6½ or 7 percent of the entire salary bill.

Mr. GROSS. I have reference to the retirement fund alone. How much are you putting in for that?

Mr. THOMAS. About $65 million.

Mr. GROSS. About $65 million?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And a substantial or significant part of that was made necessary by virtue of the salary increase bill of 1962; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly a portion of it.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to point out to the Members of the House is that when and if they vote for another salary increase—and a bill is on the way here now—they can expect to pick up a still bigger load in the retirement fund that is already $34 to $36 billion in the red.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman's arithmetic is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Your arithmetic is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I want to put the Members of the House on notice that when they get around to voting on that bill, it is not just the salary increases for which they will be voting, but voting to obligate the taxpayers for millions of dollars for increases in the retirement fund.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. The $65 million is not any part of the Government's payment of the 6½ percent on salary payrolls for the retirement fund. It is just to take care of the increased annuitant rates increased last year.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. The Government's part of that cost.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently, some people are perfectly willing to let our great grandchildren pay for the increase?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. But I want the RECORD to show that the $65 million is not the Government's share of what it owes on civil service retirement, and it is only to take care of the increases voted last year for annuitants.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. And, another few years, this is going to cost the then taxpayers $1 to $2 billion a year in order to meet the requirements of the fund, if they are met.

Mr. JONAS. The fund is about $35 billion in the red now and it is going in the red at the rate of $1.5 billion a year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I would like to say to Members on both sides of the aisle that we cannot seem to get time in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to deal with the situation that confronts the retirement fund which is $34 to $36 billion in the red. We cannot get time to do anything about it because all our time is spent bringing salary grab bills to the floor of the House, as the gentleman from Texas and the members of his committee know, who have been dealing with this huge deficit in the retirement fund. We cannot take time in the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service to meet this serious issue. The majority of the Members are always thinking in terms of increased pay. That is about all the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has done in this session of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to extend the colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. I had intended to allude to the civil service retirement fund in my original remarks during general debate, but time was limited and it was impossible to do so.

Now, there are different theories about how the Government's obligation to this fund should be taken care of. There are those who argue that it is not necessary to pay into the fund each year because the full faith and credit of the United States is involved and that the Government is obligated in the end to make up whatever deficit there is.

The other argument is that it is better to pay in every year the Government's share in order that we will have a trust fund out of which Federal employees may be assured they will have their annuities paid when they become entitled to them.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to inform the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Iowa that this committee has been the one trying to do something about the civil service retirement fund. It is now in a more critical situation than it was several years ago.

Mr. JONAS. Yes, it is getting worse at the rate of $1.5 billion a year. The unfunded liability of the Federal Government in that fund is already $35 billion. So when we talk about the national debt being $310 billion—and I read in the paper yesterday that a request is going to be made to increase this shortly to $325 billion—you can add $35 billion additional to it because this is an obligation just as binding as a note or savings bond, but it is not included in the national debt. So whatever the national debt is you have an additional liability in this one fund of $35 billion.

As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out, legislation is pending before his committee right now sponsored by the Civil Service Commission which is designed to take care of the deficit as the years go by instead of allowing the deficit to accumulate to the point where we will be at zero and have no more money left in the fund with which to pay these earned annuities. Then the Civil Service Commission will have to come to the Congress every year for a new appropriation of several billions each year to pay the annuities that have been earned. The Civil Service Commission takes the position that it would be much better to keep this fund actuarily sound; for the Government to pay in its part every year, just as the Government extracts 6.5 percent from the salary of each employee, and use that as a trust fund which could be invested to produce some income in the way of interest, which would add to the capital in the fund and keep it actuarily sound.

This is a very important subject. I would respectfully refer the members of the committee to the testimony given by Mr. Macy and his associates in the Civil Service Commission beginning on page 164, part 1, and running over for several pages. I think you will find the information set forth there very revealing. I do not believe any one can read that testimony without being concerned about the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to renew my unanimous-consent request that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and subject to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize Members on points of order.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in the bill appearing on page 45 in that paragraph beginning on line 6 and ending on line 10 and the language in the next paragraph beginning on line 12 and ending on line 23 as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For advance planning, design, and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $245,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; purchase or hire of not to exceed two aircraft for administrative use; maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase and hire of motor vehicles (including purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles, of which thirty-four shall be for replacement only); and maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; $610,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against these two paragraphs on the ground that these are appropriations for which there is no authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. May I inquire of my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] who is a very able and personable young man whom I personally like; I understand the gentleman's point of order strikes out all funds for acquisition of real property by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and, second, all funds for administrative operations.

Mr. WYDLER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. My distinguished friend knows exactly what he is doing, Mr. Chairman. His point of order is good. I hope he will not insist upon it but if the gentleman insists upon the point of order, it is a valid point of order since this has not been authorized. However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that this House of Representatives and the very able and distinguished legislative committee on space, the Committee on Space and Astronautics, of the House have certainly done their work and the bill was passed by a tremendous vote in the House. But through causes beyond the control of this body, it has not been acted upon by the other body and, of course, the point of order is good. Would my distinguished friend consider withdrawing his point of order?

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to address some remarks to the gentleman concerning the point of order in the nature of a question, if that is in order at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will indulge the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the Chairman. I would simply like to inquire if the gentleman from New York can tell us, whether if this is done, we are ever going to get a chance to move on the floor of the House to amend these sections; or if this is going to come back to us in the way of a conference report only?

Mr. WYDLER. Is the gentleman from New Hampshire directing that question to me?

Mr. WYMAN. It is directed through you to the Parliamentarian. Are we going to get a chance to amend this if your point of order is made here now or are we bound by the conference report?

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would address that question to the Chair as a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not a matter for the present occupant of the chair to decide. This is a question for the House to consider.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] rise?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I intend to make the same point of order if the gentleman from New Hampshire does not insist on his point of order, and I say that for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to be heard further on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] has made a point of order to the two paragraphs on page 45 of the bill, lines 6 to 10 and lines 12 to 23, respectively.

The Chair sustains the point of order against both paragraphs.

Are there any further points of order?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill on page 44, beginning on line 19 to and including line 4 on page 45, as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Research and development

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance and operation of other than administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; $4,345,000,000, to remain available until expended.

I make a point of order against that paragraph on the ground that it is an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be heard on the point of order. I regretfully admit the point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill on page 46, line 2 to and including line 16, as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without consent of the Congress.

I make a point of order against that paragraph on the ground that it is an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my former remark. The point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas concedes the point of order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further points of order to the bill? If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the House that it will be the intention of your subcommittee, when we go to conference, to restore to the bill every item—which includes construction, the cost of laboratories, personnel, research and development—and every dime that has been stricken, of course, legally, by points of order. I wish to make the record clear on that point.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARRIS was given permission to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join our colleagues in commending the distinguished chairman and other distinguished members of this committee for the diligent and fine work they have accomplished in bringing to the House this appropriation bill. I know they have had difficulty in arriving at what are considered to be the best decisions and solutions to problems. I commend them for it.

I know the committee has made a diligent effort to do the job that has been challenging them, to carry out the functions of Government as contained in this appropriation bill. I know they have given much thought, consideration, and time to economizing, and to meeting the challenges, and to providing reductions wherever they felt, from the information they have had, were justified. For that effort I join others in applauding the committee.

I am quite concerned about the provision which is included in the appropriation bill having to do with the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency for the next fiscal year. The committee has made some rather drastic cuts. There is a reduction of $10 million in operations. The committee reduced by 33 percent the request for towers and communication equipment, such as radar sites and so forth, to carry out the new program of communications. The committee has also reduced by one-half the requested amounts for research and development, from $42 to $21 million.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that this Agency has grown large rather fast, but we know there is a reason for it. The act of 1958 provided for a consolidation of the communications services and operation of the airways, a consolidation of commercial private flying and the military. We know that the personnel of the Agency necessarily had to be expanded. It is a large agency.

We also know that since that time our aviation industry has progressed so rapidly that today airplanes are being flown which will travel faster than the speed of sound. We know that faster planes will come into play in the future.

So there is justification for it. The committee recognizes that. I know that there is a question about the research and development program, because there are some carryovers to meet some of the needs.

However, I want to call to the attention of all Members of this House the problem of flight service stations. Many of you have been to me and to other members of the committee, expressing great concern about what is happening to the reduction of this service and the closing out of a good many of these flight service stations. Let me remind you that there has already been an announcement made that 42 of the 297 flight service stations are being closed out on a graduated basis. What that means is that the Federal Aviation Agency will necessarily be required to reduce certain services of the aviation industry. There is contemplated an ultimate program of 150 flight service stations plus a number of satellite stations in an effort to meet the economy demands that have been made on the Agency.

What concerns me is that the committee has reduced the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency for the next fiscal year by $10 million. By this you have said in your committee report that in addition to the 754 jobs which have been reduced by the Agency itself, you want the Agency to make another reduction of 1,500 employees. If it can be done without reducing services, it ought to be done, but we are advised that the substantial reduction of the additional 1,500 employees is going to come from the reduction of the flight service stations. That means that within the next 12 months these 42 flight service stations will be cut out.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of this committee if it is the intention and purpose of the committee that a substantial part of this reduction be used for the purpose of reducing the flight service stations and immediately cut down the service of these stations that are now existing.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will yield to me, the answer to my able and distinguished friend—and I am never in too much disagreement with him—is this: You have 299 of these stations now. The Administrator—not this subcommittee, but the Administrator—during the next 15 months wants to reduce this number by 42. The overall cost by any stretch of the imagination brought about by the reduction will not be more than $2.5 or $3 million. So, out of the $10 million cut, this item will not be reduced by more than $2.5 million. I cannot see why it will be reduced that much, Mr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. That is why I want to discuss that with the distinguished chairman. I wanted to discuss this with the distinguished chairman because we have just had a hearing in our committee on this problem. Our committee was told only last week that the reduction of this service would be 42 of the 299, and out of that there would be approximately 600 jobs that would go with it.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a high figure, but go ahead.

Mr. HARRIS. Approximately 600. We were also advised that the average salary of the personnel was about $9,000.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. That is not only the salary but the expenses that go with it. The salaries would be substantially less than that, but let us say about $9,000 a year total expense. That would mean $5.4 million. That is more than half of the total $10 million reduction in operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

(Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. THOMAS) was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARRIS. I regret to take so much time.

Mr. THOMAS. You are entitled to it.

Mr. HARRIS. But any number of Members of this House have been to us in the last several months and have been greatly concerned about the flight service stations in their home towns and throughout the country. We are told by the Administrator that if the 1,500 additional job reduction is required, as the committee report states, they will have to go to the top priority and that means that approximately 600 people in this particular type of service will go. That means that 42 stations will be closed down immediately under the program, which is not agreed to by everybody, otherwise they will graduate them through a period of 12 to 24 months. I want to make certain that we do not get caught in the middle. I would like to get the gentleman to advise the House that they are not going to be closed down by this recommendation of reduction or accept an amendment which I am prepared to offer.

Mr. THOMAS. I have seen the gentleman's amendment. Will the gentleman yield to me at this time?

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. I think our able and genial friend, the Administrator, Mr. Halaby, may be puffing the figures a little bit; I do not mean he is doing that arbitrarily, but he is putting his best sales foot forward. Certainly by no stretch of the imagination, as I see it, could that reduction be any more than 50 percent of what he says it is. His top figure is $5 or $5½ million. We think it will be less, about $2½ million at the most. Regardless of that, may I say to my able friend from Arkansas, one of the great chairmen of this House—he certainly does a tremendous job——

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman, but let us get on with this.

Mr. THOMAS. We will meet with the gentleman and his committee in the morning——

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman object to my offering this amendment now, and then he could take it with him and work it out?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not want to do it that way. Will the gentleman permit our committee to come over to his committee room tomorrow morning, have the Administrator over there, and I will guarantee that we will work it out to his satisfaction?

Mr. HARRIS. But in the meantime the bill will have passed and be on its way. It will not do any good to talk about it after you close down these stations.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman means that the bill will be passed by our brothers here today?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; it will be passed here today.

Mr. THOMAS. But the other body is not through talking yet. The gentleman does not mean that it will become law. It will pass the House, but it will not become law by tomorrow.

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct, but so far as we are concerned, it will have passed, the gentleman will have his program.

Mr. THOMAS. We will get the Administrator over to the gentleman's office tomorrow, regardless of what is done here now.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman this question, and I think it is a fair question. Is it the intention that these 42 flight service stations be closed down immediately?

Mr. THOMAS. No, it is not; I would say in about 15 months, or 12 to 15 months.

Mr. HARRIS. What are they going to do for money in the next 12 months?

Mr. THOMAS. There is money provided in here now until June 30.

Mr. HARRIS. June 30 of this year, but I am thinking about the next fiscal year.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. There are some members of this committee who do not want the flight service stations closed. Protests have been made to the Administrator. The Administrator says that he wants to make certain economies. But the Administrator could make some of these economies without closing down these flight stations, at least he could make these economies without closing a substantial number of these flight service stations.

Mr. HARRIS. That is precisely what I am concerned with. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be compelled to offer this amendment, in view of the situation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: On page 11, line 19, immediately after "facilities," insert the following "the continuation of the existing authorized domestic flight service stations".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments

thereto close in 30 minutes, with the last 5 minutes being reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall now proceed to explain my amendment.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. First of all, may I say to the gentleman that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I share his concern about the flight service stations and I know that many Members of the House are concerned about it. We discussed this matter in our hearings. As I see it, the matter of dollars is not involved here. The FAA has authority, as I understand it, to do it or not to do it. I see no way by which we in appropriating funds can protect or continue more of these flight service stations than the administration desires to continue.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say to my distinguished friend from New York that I appreciate his interest and I know all members of this Committee are interested in this question. However, I feel that through the adoption of the amendment which I have offered, it does not involve increased sums of appropriations. It only provides for the continuance of these stations for the next 12 months.

Let me tell you why it is important to do this. It is a question of whether or not we are going to give the Agency time to phase out some stations and to work it out for the best interest.

Mr. Chairman, it will take a period of 12 to 16 months and maybe a little longer to do this. What the committee has done is this: They reduce by $10 million operations of the agency. They say they are going to accomplish the bulk of the reduction in the reduction of the flight service stations. On the other hand, if you reduce this service, it requires the remoting of this information from another station somewhere. It takes time to get the facilities installed. They cannot do it merely through the snap of the finger. It will require several months.

On the other hand, the committee has reduced the funds recommended for additional equipment and facilities by one-third, or $25 million. This means the FAA is going to say that they cannot acquire the remoting facilities to remote this information to the station where they would get the information. This would bring about a reduction in them. Therefore, you cannot have the service, either direct or by remoting.

Now, what we would do by this amendment, if what the gentleman says is correct, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]—we would say that within the amount of funds appropriated, they would have to continue the operation of these flight service stations, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would request that the gentleman from Arkansas, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and others persuade the Administrator not to close these stations. He said he could keep them on, but he wants to economize in this field. However, I feel he can economize elsewhere.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. If the Committee adopts this amendment, then we would have the assurance on the part of the Members of the House that this would be done.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California. The gentleman has a very serious problem in his district with which he has been wrestling for months.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I would like to take this time to direct a question to the gentleman from Tennessee, who has alluded to the fact that the Administrator has requested these closures.

We have been told that there was a directive from the Committee on Appropriations itself suggesting that they have to close them. Could the gentleman answer that question? Is this a fact? Has there been a directive from the committee to the Administrator to close them?

Mr. EVINS. If the gentleman from Arkansas will yield, there was language in the report last year directing the Administrator to practice economy wherever he thought possible, because we though the Agency was top heavy and that it should be reduced. This is where he chose to make that reduction.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. If the gentleman from Arkansas will yield further, is it not the personal feeling of the gentleman from Tennessee that there are other areas where economies could be effected other than in this area?

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say this, in the first place. Yes; the committee had language last year, and I think appropriately so, directing this Agency to start reducing. It did start reducing. It has reached its maximum. It is going down. They have reduced by 1,100 in the amount of personnel since last year and they are going down more. There are 754 reductions in the Agency budget. The committee would cut the force by 1,500 in addition to the reduction proposed by the Agency. It is rather drastic and we do not want it to fall primarily on flight service stations.

I think it has reached its peak and coming down, but let us not all of a sudden start cutting on the service because, I may say to my colleagues, it is a dangerous situation when you start flying through the air without the right kind of safety information to go with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. I certainly hope that this amendment is adopted. I believe that if the FAA and the committee could conclusively demonstrate that genuine economies can be achieved, without the loss of safety, everybody would favor the remoting of information now handled by these flight service stations.

The FAA has estimated that the closing of the flight service station at Huntington, W. Va., would result in a savings of between $26,400 and $36,700 per year. One human life could not be calculated in terms of the figures I have just cited, yet safety would be threatened by this move. Some people contend that it would be just as easy for a pilot to pick up a phone to some remote center and get the same type of information he now gets personally across the counter. The general aviation pilots to a man say their safety is threatened when you take away the flight experts who know the mountainous terrain.

What about the costs of relocating personnel, building new communications buildings and equipment, and the other cost factors? I do not believe all these have been fully documented, and these are aside from the vital considerations of safety.

I commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for the hearings he has held on this subject. I certainly hope that the amendment of the able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be adopted, and I strongly urge that in the interests of safety and genuine economy the pending amendment be adopted.

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, like the distinguished gentleman who preceded me, I wish, also, to compliment this committee on the efforts they have made to bring about some economy in the operation of these agencies and, in particular, the Federal Aviation Agency. In the bill which is presently before us, the Federal Aviation Agency has been reduced $10 million in operational funds, $25 million in facilities and equipment, $21 million in research and development, and several other smaller reductions.

I am not too much concerned with the decrease in the amount of money appropriated for facilities and equipment for, indeed, according to the committee report, there is $126 million left over for this purpose. Insofar as I can determine from the information I have at hand, that should be sufficient to meet their needs for this purpose during the next year. I am not too much concerned about the reduction in R. & D. because much of the R. & D. activities presently carried on by the Federal Aviation Agency are a duplication of efforts in other agencies of government.

I am deeply concerned, however, over the reduction recommended in the appropriation for operation and maintenance of their facilities.

I requested the Federal Aviation Agency to give me information as to how they intended to use the additional money they had put in their budget request for operations and maintenance. I was told it was for the purpose of operating newly allocated facilities—and I

have a list in my hand—10 long-range radars, 6 terminal radars, 33 air traffic control radar beacons, 19 traffic control towers and combined station/tower, 25 remote air-ground peripheral communications outlets, 103 Doppler direction finder equipment, 29 limited remote communications outlets, 247 short-range navigation facilities, 8 instrument landing systems, 22 approach light systems, 32 runway end identification lights, 12 visual approach slope indicators, and 12 low/medium frequency facilities.

All of these, Mr. Chairman, are instruments of safety in the operation of aircraft.

Funds for the operation and maintenance of these facilities was the purpose of their requesting an increase in their operations budget for next year. The committee saw fit not to grant the increase but, instead, reduced their request by $10 million.

What does this mean? This means that the equipment I have just listed is either ready to go into operation or will be ready to go into operation by January 1, 1965. The Federal Aviation Agency is going to have to operate this equipment because of the investment which has been made out of funds appropriated previously. This equipment is necessary to our air traffic control system and to the safety of the operation of aircraft. If the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas is not adopted, and if this $10 million cut goes through, the Agency is going to have to find some other place to make this up. The most convenient place for them to reach is in the field of general aviation, which is not represented by the Air Transport Association or the big airlines, but is the field of business aviation, agricultural aviation, private aviation. That would strike at the greatest service that is rendered to private aviation, that is, the flight service station system.

In 1949 we had over 500 flight service stations in the 48 States. Today that number has been reduced to 297.

If Mr. Halaby goes through with his present plan for remoting these 42 flight service stations and reducing the number eventually to 150, what he calls hard-core stations, it will result in a very dangerous curtailment of service to the general aviation community.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Halaby goes through with this and he remotes all stations inside of a 100-mile radius, that is going to mean we will have to have minimum areas of 31,460 square miles where there will be only one weather reporting agency and only one place where a pliot can get his weather information. For the general aviation pilot that is a very, very dangerous thing.

It has not been told to you that these flight service stations average over 1,100 saves per year. That means these flight service stations are responsible for saving 1,100 aircraft per year from possible disaster—and goodness only knows how many lives they save in the process.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I do not ask these questions in any critical way, but to get the benefit of the great knowledge that the gentleman from Mississippi has on this subject. We were told in committee by Mr. Halaby and his associates that they can provide equivalent services, just as expert service, just as quick service, and just as effective service with a telephone operation which they propose to substitute for the stations and, yet, save a substantial amount of money. Now I am not making that argument. But I say we were told that by the FAA witnesses. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would address some comment to that proposal which was made in committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will do my best if I have the time. I am afraid we are not going to have the time to go into it in great detail. Mr. Halaby can render the same enroute services to the airlines and cross country pilots by remoting and by telephone, but he certainly cannot render the same service to the general aviation pilot who goes into the flight service station and stands eyeball to eyeball with the people in the service station and takes a look at the weather reports himself and takes their advice. In other words, remoting will remove a most necessary and vital terminal service now utilized by our pilots.

Now, when Mr. Halaby made his original announcement, he indicated he was going to remote all of these stations to what he called hard-core stations. He was just going to abolish all of these stations, that is, those 42 stations, which would also result in reducing weather information, particularly local weather information, made available to pilots.

Later on he apparently realized that he had made a mistake so he began to retreat. Now he has come in with an alternative plan. He says now he is going to abolish these stations and he plans to substitute in their place a system of what he called manicom operations whereby one or two men provide a sort of skeleton type of limited operation. However, he is not yet ready to explain fully the details of this manicom operation to the committee. He is unable to tell us, for instance, how many frequencies will be available to the pilots in flight through use of these manicoms. He has not been able to tell us how many lines will be required from the manicom station to the so-called central or hard-core stations. He has not been able to tell us exactly how much it is going to cost. He is not able to tell us how much this experiment that he plans to put in as a substitute is going to cost. He has not been able to show the committee thus far that there will be any real substantial savings in this entire discontinuance operation that is contemplated.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] has a very peculiar situation in his district at a place called Arcata, where the weather can move in suddenly and be gone in the next 25 minutes. A pilot flying in that area never knows what kind of weather he will run into at Arcata. If the Arcata station is abandoned, as Mr. Halaby plans, there will be no weather information available at Arcata for the pilots flying in and out of that area. If the station is retained, weather information will be available.

The same thing holds true at Brunswick, Ga., in the district of Congressman TUTEN. The weather moves in suddenly, and 15 minutes later it is gone. In the meantime the pilot "upstairs" has no way in the world of knowing what the weather is at the station.

As I mentioned a moment ago, if Mr. Halaby goes through with this proposition of putting these stations a minimum of 100 miles apart, this will mean there will be an area of 31,416 square miles wherein there is only one weather-reporting facility available. In my opinion, this compromises safety.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the continuation of these flight service stations is absolutely essential. It is essential in the interest of aviation safety. It is essential in the interest of our aviation system.

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague from Mississippi in a bipartisan approach to the flight service station problem and in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

At the outset I also wish to extend my thanks to the chairman and to the other fine members of this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, who have heard me before on this subject.

True, like many people, I came into this debate because I had extenuating circumstances with respect to a flight service station in my own area. I can advise the members of the committee that Mr. Halaby admitted an error has been made, not only at the Arcata facility, but also in some five others. This only points to the fact that there are problems not only with respect to the particular flight service station in my district, but with respect to many of them throughout the country.

Frankly, there is too little knowledge of the overall service that a flight service station provides. When we consider this particular problem, I believe one thing has not been taken into account, and that is the lack of flexibility in the criteria established on these particular facilities. Heretofore general aviation has been totally dependent upon the flight service station as the main line of communication and a navigational aid. The airlines do not have this prob-

lem, because they have their own duplicating facilities.

I believe what has happened here is that where we have the en route navigational facility which takes care of the aircraft en route, we have not taken into account the tremendous responsibility of the flight service station in providing terminal facilities where towers are nonexistent. Unless this is available, pilots of aircraft will be caught out under very serious and changing weather circumstances and will not be able to safely land the airplane or be advised of existing weather conditions by a qualified flight specialist.

If I had an hour I could tell of my personal experiences, since I have been a professional flier, and how I have saved lives virtually because of the fact that I had "educated eyeballs" serving at the flight service station, giving me up-to-the-minute observations in areas where the fog conditions can change in a matter of minutes.

If I had the opportunity, I should like to take all of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations with me in my aircraft, to demonstrate specifically what can or cannot be done. No one can fully understand the extent of the problem unless he has had cockpit or pilot compartment exposure.

I believe that one of the reasons why this particular amendment is so important is that it coincides with the hearings now being held by Mr. WILLIAMS' Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics. These hearings will bring out more and more of the problems facing the general aviation community should a loss of communication facilities take place, where terminal services are necessary.

I believe we shouud have about 12 months to again evaluate the problem. Then we can come back and report to the Appropriations Committee something of real value.

The hearings which I held in my own district were attended by people from all over California. I feel certain that if any Member could have been a witness at those hearings he would have agreed that there were some very serious mistakes made in suggesting the removing of the Arcata facility.

On the matter of the FAA budget, there may be areas in which we can cut.

I am not an expert on this, because I am not on the committee that hears testimony, but I am personally convinced in my own mind that the one thing we need to do in order to expand business in this area is to recognize the advantages which are available only in the general aviation community. Airlines do not need this and the military are pretty well set, but the business fleet of this Nation will be responsible for our growth. If we do not recognize this as an opportunity to change the economics, we will not be consistent in some of our thinking here on the floor of the Congress. We spend all sorts of money to try to change the economy. We should be giving some consideration possibly to expanding landing aids and communication facilities rather than cutting back. If this is an error of the administrator, then the entire Congress should let the administrator know it and know in no uncertain terms that we do not agree with him. After all, we are the representatives of the people. They have expressed their wishes very vigorously to many members of Congress. I think it is our responsibility to express the wishes of our constituents to the agencies involved. In this way, we can work together for the common good of all aviation users.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Yes. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HECHLER. Is it not true that the administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency failed to state exactly what economies can be achieved in dollars and cents as a result of the proposals that have been made with regard to flight service stations?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Yes. I am sure that when the committee hearings that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is holding now are completed, you will have ample evidence of what you just suggested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the administrator said that the closing of these stations in the remote and hard core areas and replacement by telephone leased wires, and so forth, would effect an eventual saving of some $3.5 million which would become effective along about 1967. Before we would realize any real saving it would be about 1967. However, he realized subsequent to that time this was not going to render the service that was necessary to be rendered to the general aviation community and to the airlines in some cases and now he is going to substitute a so-called manicom system which will entail the purchase of additional equipment and stringing additional telephone lines and leasing of them. It is impossible at this point to determine whether there will be any savings at all.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I agree with the gentleman, and I urge the support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I believe it important to keep our minds on the dollars with respect to operations under the Federal Aviation Agency. Now, if I recall correctly, we have appropriated nearly $10 million more for operations than was appropriated last year for this same general purpose. Our committee expressed concern about this flight service station program and the proposal on the part of the Administrator to reduce the total number by some 42. Questions were raised as to the desirability of making certain closings in view of the proximity of one to the other. If I understood the Administrator correctly, he admitted that there would be no savings in the closing of these flight service stations in the first instance, because under the terms of this bill the money is there for these stations as they exist today, but the consolidations will cost just as much money for some time to come before savings ultimately would be achieved.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman said that you have increased the amount of the appropriations for general purposes. Was there an increase in money for the specific purpose which is the subject of this amendment?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Well, no. We do not appropriate specifically for one service or another. This flight service station operation comes within the category of operations under the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that out of the $537 million or $538 million total that is carried in this legislation for operations a very small percentage of it is for the operation of the flight service stations?

Mr. OSTERTAG. To a certain degree that is correct. Perhaps slightly under 10 percent of the overall operations costs of the FAA.

Mr. HARRIS. Therefore, the $10 million in addition to the total operations over last year should not necessarily be considered in this matter because the flight service operation costs only a relatively small part of the total.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will my able friend and counterpart from New York yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us set the record straight on this flight service station operation. This very small percent will amount to just $52 million this year. Let us get the record straight on this.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. In partial answer to the last statement of the gentleman from Texas, my own consideration of this overall problem is prompted by the proposed closing of one of these flight service stations in my district. It indicates that this is not sound economy, that this is false economy and we may well be trying to save money at the risk of human life. I do not think you can compromise in the area of air safety. In my judgment, these stations perform a very valuable and necessary function. I strongly support the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have to oppose this amendment because I do not think we ought to be legislating here

on an appropriation bill. While the amendment is perhaps not technically subject to a point of order we are dealing with a legislative matter. We cannot here on the floor of the House or in a committee tell Mr. Halaby where he ought to have a flight station and where he does not need one. Do you not see what we get if we start issuing directives to the head of the Federal Aviation Agency, telling him that he is making a mistake if he takes out 42 flight stations all over the United States? How do we know, and what opportunities do we have to know, whether the places he proposes to eliminate ought to be eliminated or not? That is an executive function.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to close the debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully state to my colleagues that this amendment ought to be defeated. We are all for economy, but "Do not economize on me." That is the old standard rule. Here is this agency. If there is any agency in government that has done well in the way of appropriations, it has. There is only $833 million in the budget this year and for the last 7 years it has gone from 24,000 to 47,000 employees. This is a matter that involves $52 million.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will tie the hands of the Administrator. Now, listen carefully to this. Under this amendment he cannot close one of the 299 stations—not one. Under the bill we are now considering he has authority to close not one; that is to say, it is not mandatory that he close even one. Why tie his hands? As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] so ably pointed out, this amendment is subject to a point of order. My able friend from Arkansas and I discussed that awhile ago, but I did not care to raise the point. Let us vote this amendment down. The Administrator is the expert, not the members of this strong committee. My friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are able men.

They are able. There is no question about that. They are fine pilots. However, I am not going to take their judgment against the judgment of the Administrator of this agency and his experts. It is his job and their job and not our job to do this.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that we vote this amendment down and let the Administrator work his will. He is not going haywire about this thing. It is not mandatory under the language of this bill that he even close one. Do the members of the Committee understand that language?

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt this amendment then the Administrator cannot close one station. Now, I say let him work his will.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas; of course I will.

Mr. HARRIS. I think we should understand what the actual facts are.

Mr. THOMAS. I have given them to you.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield further, all right——

Mr. THOMAS. Do not doubt that. I have given the facts to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman knows that the Administrator does not intend under his program to close one of these stations in the next 12 months; is that not right?

Mr. THOMAS. From 12 to 15 months.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that he is not and does not intend to close even 1 of the 42 stations in the next 12 months?

Mr. THOMAS. Well——

Mr. HARRIS. Is not that a fact or not?

Mr. THOMAS. This bill would cover the operations of this agency until June of 1965—June 30 of next year—and during that time he says he will close whatever he intends to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Can anyone here conceive of the Federal Aviation Administrator flying in the face of any directive from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, of course not.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, if hearings are conducted and if you tell him "You are making a mistake to close XYZ or ABC flight stations," can anyone imagine his closing them down in the face of this directive?

Mr. THOMAS. We offered to meet with him in the morning and straighten it out. Does anyone doubt that this man who dreams and thinks of safety 15 hours a day is going to do anything to jeopardize the safety of the people of this country?

Mr. Chairman, let us see what is involved here. Here are a few of these little flight stations located over the country. They only have one or two employees; that is all. Ask my distinguished friend the gentleman from California what he has. Where does that man get the information to whom you talk? He gets it over the telephone. He cannot see over 15 or 20 miles from where he is standing. If you close it, you are going to pick up the telephone and get the same information that is given to you direct. Let us be frank about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOLE moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes on his preferential motion.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I agree with our distinguished chairman that everyone wants economy. However, in my particular district they are contemplating closing 3 of the 42 flight service stations and I do not want such a generous share of the FAA economy achieved in the district it is my honor to represent unless there is justification for it.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the FAA Administrator is talking about a potential savings of about $1.5 million. This is much less than the amount the Chairman, Mr. THOMAS, talks of saving by closing flight service stations.

Permit me to point out, without being critical or passing judgment, that in 1963 the Government shelled out $1.5 million to buy a new Lockheed Jetstar for Mr. Halaby's use. Also the FAA agency purchased eight Beechcraft Queen Air 80's at a cost of $229,000 each. To justify this expense, the Agency said that it was necessary "to keep the general aviation inspectors current and proficient in production aircraft."

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lieurance, Director, Aviation Weather Service, appeared before the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and he indicated they have not even completed the study in connection with the 42 announced closings.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear the announcement to close 42 stations was made first—followed by efforts of justification. We ask only that there be justification for closing any or all 42. If it can be demonstrated to Members of the House the same service can be offered and same safety features provided after closing as now offered there can be no serious objection to closing the flight service stations.

But, Mr. Chairman, until there is this justification all interested parties are entitled to their day in court.

Mr. Chairman, in letters from agents of the FAA, which shall be included, I have not received satisfactory justification for this proposed action. I am told the net reduction will be 162 employees if the closings are carried out. However, the savings is only about $1.5 million out of some $50 million, or the exact figure the Chairman mentioned. So it is not a very significant amount.

Mr. Chairman, people from my congressional district and from many other districts were here last week to testify with reference to this matter. Not a one complained about the economy factors but about the fact there had not been justification or complete consideration of other vital factors.

I am not a pilot and hence not equipped to argue the technical merits of the case, and as stated before, I strongly feel economy in our Federal Government is a necessity; but there should be justification by the FAA Administrator, Mr. Halaby. It seems rather strange to notify Members of Congress one day that stations will be closed, and on the next send emissaries to each of the areas involved to meet with the mayors, pilots, and other interested parties and advise them, after the decision was made, they were to lose their flight service station.

Why was a decision reached prior to the completion of studies by the FAA and the Weather Bureau? If studies were in fact made, why are they not made available now to Members of Congress? Not a single one of these six witnesses who appeared from the First Congressional District of Kansas wants the Federal Government to spend $1 unnecessarily, but they would appreciate, and are entitled to, justification being made. If there is a satisfactory showing by the agencies involved that there will be a real savings, no increased hazards to the hundreds of thousands of pilots and passengers who use private, low altitude air travel, and that the estimated economy is in line with economies in urban areas, and the Administrator's own expenditures, then I shall not object. The best information obtainable is that the bulk of the savings will result from the fact that eventually—we are not told when—there will be 162 fewer employees, but this does not seem completely reasonable. I am making a separate effort to determine how much is spent by the Federal Government each year in various phases of safety and accident prevention, to determine whether or not the estimated million and one-half dollar saving is of any real significance.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
CENTRAL REGION,
Kansas City, Mo., February 28, 1964.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOLE: Mr. Halaby has requested me to reply to your February 13, 1964, letter regarding consolidation of the Russell, Kans.; Goodland, Kans.; and Dodge City, Kans., Flight Service Stations.

Your assumption about the requirement for these stations in the past is correct. Historically, they were needed to provide air-to-ground communications for en route traffic. As a communications link, the flight service stations were located primarily along principal airways to provide continuous radio communications coverage. The stations also provide a variety of other services, such as aeronautical and weather briefings for pilots, flight plan handling and reporting weather observations.

Technical advances in the air traffic control system have made consolidation of stations possible. Communication facilities can be remoted without degrading the service or reducing air safety. For example, Air Route Traffic Control Centers have used remote outlets for a number of years in issuing air traffic control clearances to aircraft operating on instrument flight plans. This same principle will be used when flight service stations are consolidated. Other essential services such as flight plan handling and pilot briefings will be handled by nontoll telephone lines. Weather observations will continue to be made locally and the data will be disseminated over the same teletypewriter network as used at present.

Present plans are to remote Russell into Salina, Kans.; Goodland and Dodge City into Garden City, Kans. The personnel complement at both Salina and Garden City will be increased sufficiently to handle the additional workload. The combined increase, however, will not be as great as the number of positions required to man the separate locations. It appears that a net savings of approximately 10 positions will be possible with the consolidation.

It will require 12 to 24 months to accomplish this consolidation. Personnel at Goodland and Dodge City will be reassigned to Garden City, or another location of their choice, to the greatest extent possible. Personnel at Russell will be handled in the same manner; either to Salina or another location of their choice if possible. Retirements, attrition and normal turnover of personnel are expected to create sufficient vacancies so that no person will be adversely affected to the extent of being without a job.

Representatives from this office held conferences at each location where stations were scheduled to be relocated. Conferences were attended by local civic leaders, representatives of aviation interests and news-reporters. Reactions varied, but in no case were essential service requirements stated which are not expected to be met upon completion of the consolidation program.

Your personal interest in this matter is appreciated. We believe it is important that you understand our continuing modernization of the airways. If we can be of further service to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. BEARDSLEE,
Director.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1964.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOLE: Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1964, to Mr. Halaby, signed also by Senator PEARSON, concerning the FAA flight service station program.

The initial phase of the flight service station study is complete and identifies 42 stations to be consolidated with others. The estimated net savings to the Government is $1,500,000 anuually; and the one-time capital cost ($1,470,000) of this phase of the program will be recovered from the operational savings during the first year.

The FAA selection criteria for the first 42 stations to be consolidated were based generally on aeronautical weather and cost considerations rather than adherence to State or political boundaries. The enclosed paper outlines this criteria in some detail.

The FAA has undertaken the station reduction program only after intensive study and with benefit of experience at some 60 locations where remoted stations have been operated satisfactorily during recent years. The announcement of the first phase results was purposely made well in advance of the actual implementation dates so that users would have sufficient time to study the plan and make known their reactions.

The overall staffing of FAA stations will be reduced by about 162 positions and this will account for most of the program savings. However, the employees so displaced will be offered assignments to existing vacancies elsewhere in the air traffic system without loss of grade or salary.

When two flight service stations are consolidated, the primary functions (air/ground communications) of both are continued with one staff instead of two. Pilot briefings and flight plan services are also continued at the remoted site by means of a direct toll-free telephone line to the controlling station; and, in those cases where FAA takes weather observations, the responsibility of such services reverts to the U.S. Weather Bureau, and full prior coordination with that agency assures continuity of the necessary weather services. Thus, important aeronautical and weather services, needed in various degrees by all pilots, will still be available and at considerably reduced cost to the Government.

We trust that this information will bring about a better understanding and acceptance of the station consolidation program. If we can be of further service, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

LEE E. WARREN,
Director, Air Traffic Service.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING 42 FLIGHT SERVICE STATIONS FOR CONSOLIDATION—JANUARY 1964

At the present time, there are 296 manned flight service stations (FSS) in the contiguous 48 States. Sixty more sites receive essentially the same services via remote radio and landlines as part of previous consolidation programs. There are also 250 Weather Bureau stations (WBAS). tA 110 locations, there is both an FSS and a WBAS and 99 are at the same airport.

During the past several months, the FAA has been intensively studying the role of the flight service station in the future air traffic system with a view to keeping these facilities abreast of changing aeronautical demands and effecting economies wherever possible without loss of essential services. An integral part of this study has been a joint FAA/U.S. Weather Bureau effort to identify needed weather services at the station locations and continue them in the most effective manner consistent with prudent use of public funds. The whole study is still in progress and is expected to be completed within the next few months.

Meanwhile, so that as much advance notice as possible might be given to the personnel at these locations, to the communities, and to the aviation users, the 42 stations selected for consolidation were made known in advance of the completion of the study.

The basic selection criteria for the 42 consolidations are as follows:

(1) Weather observing requirement is, or can be, met by means other than the FSS; viz:

(a) An existing WBAS.

(b) Other Government stations; e.g., an FAA tower, a military base, or the Coast Guard.

(c) Supplementary aviation weather reporting station (SAWRS) where Weather Bureau provides weather measuring equipment at the airport and trains airport or airline personnel in weather observing. Observers are not paid by the Government.

(d) Weather Bureau furnishes, installs, and maintains equipment and selects and trains local citizens as observers. The observers work part time to meet a predetermined schedule for observations and are paid on a fee basis.

(e) Combination of (c) and (d) above.

NOTE.—Categories (a) and (b) are almost always 24-hour observations, whereas (c), (d), and (e) may be less than 24 hours as determined by aeronautical and synoptic requirements.

(2) Essential services of the FSS's, except for weather observations, can be provided from a remote location via telephone, wire, and/or radio links without diminishing air safety and without noticeable reduction in flight services to aviation users.

(3) A net savings to the Government can be demonstrated both in terms of continuing operational and maintenance costs as well as personnel. These savings must take into account the costs of remoting equipment and lines and any expenses incurred in replacing essential observational or other services through other means.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOLE: We have had a chance to thoroughly review the well prepared report

of the Flight Service Station at Russell, Kans., presented by Mr. Townsley and the delegation which visited us in Washington. We greatly appreciate the time and effort that these people have gone to and they have done an excellent job of presenting their case.

I want to reconfirm the fact that the consolidation is not planned to take place for 12 to 24 months. However, the Agency has not changed its position concerning the consolidation of the 42 flight service stations which are scheduled to be remoted at that time. We believe that the net savings to the Government justify our action. Although the same terminal services will not be provided, the essential enroute services will be available through remote facilities.

We do appreciate the interest on the part of the community and their efforts to come to Washington to present their case. I assure you we thoroughly reviewed the matter in view of their visit and your vigorous inquiries. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter we sent to Mr. Townsley.

Thank you for your continuing interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

WM. J. SCHULTE,
Assistant Administrator.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to make clear again that we are not asking for any increase in the total amount of funds.

We have been told that if the $10 million reduction made by the committee is approved, it is going to be taken out on the reduction of flight service stations. What we are saying here is you shall not take all of the economy out of this service, you have to find it somewhere else.

Let me say one other thing, and I would not imply anything insofar as the intentions of my distinguished friend from Texas is concerned, but may I say to the gentleman that the program has been outlined and these reductions will be made perhaps in the next 12 months in man-hours in the various given stations, but no flight service station is intended to be closed down in the next 12 months. At the end of the next 12 months from then to the following 12 months they are going to phase out the service and improve it with a reorganization which will create a total of about 150 flight service stations with some satellites all around. It takes a little while to provide telephone facilities that the gentleman mentioned.

All we are doing here, I repeat, is to say to the Administrator that if you are going to make a $10 million reduction it cannot all come out of the flight service. If I could have gotten the assurance of the gentleman I would feel differently.

Mr. THOMAS. But the language does not say that.

Mr. HARRIS. I assure you that the language does.

Mr. DOLE. Let me point this out: There has been talk about experts but they have already indicated that 6 of the 42 should probably not have been closed.

Mr. THOMAS. If he has made a mistake they will rectify it.

Mr. HARRIS. If he does not have the money he cannot operate them, and he says that the high priority is here.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that the facilities that the FAA has, and that Mr. Halaby has to fly around the country are used in the upper stratosphere. The small businessman or farmer who flies a single-engine airplane or twin-engine airplane will be flying between 4,000 and 10,000 feet. At this altitude he can only reach out on the radio probably 60, 70, 80, or perhaps 100 miles. Consequently, if that station is closed and remote control furnishes the weather, there is a vacuum in that particular vacuum 300-mile area, extending 150 miles each way.

(Mr. DOLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

I think it ought to be said that the planes that Mr. Halaby has are planes used for the purpose of testing facilities in the airways system, and some are also sent out from headquarters for accident investigations.

I appreciate the statement of the Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who is an important Member of Congress, and also his colleague. I also appreciate that there is an Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, which is an organization that has been kicking Mr. Halaby around since he has been Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and that organization has also kicked his predecessor around. It is one of the most pampered organizations in this Nation insofar as doing things that they think they ought to have in air safety and air transportation is concerned.

What the chairman of the subcommittee says to you is this: We have not been told by Mr. Halaby he would close one station, nor does the chairman indicate by the bill we have brought in here that he is forced to close one station. I think we ought to go along with the recommendation of the subcommittee. The Administrator of FAA will pay some attention, of course he will, to the subcommittee that is now airing the question of whether or not these flight stations ought to be closed.

Some of these flight stations were established many years ago. There are 299 of them, I think now, and he recommends closing 42. I do not doubt for a moment that some mistakes have been made. Some such stations have been closed. The gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] came before our committee. He made a good case on the Eureka-Arcata station, as I recall it. I do not think that Mr. Halaby has closed that station, but I do not think either that we ought to tell him through this amendment that has been proposed here that he cannot close any station. We ought to give him the discretion and the power to do so if they ought to be closed.

These flight stations, as I said, were established many, many years ago. All that he seeks to do is to remote some of these stations. You can pick a telephone up and get the same information as you can get by going up to a counter where a man is and seeing him, as both the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] said, in an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation.

That is the whole sum and substance of this argument here. We have no quarrel with those who think that they ought to get better service. We are not saying that you will not get better service by what we do here at all. This is a discretion that we leave with the Administrator. I think it should be within his discretion. I think he will do the job that ought to be done, keeping in mind the safety of those who fly private planes. It is in this area that we have the greatest concern because they are the people who use the flight service stations more than any other segment of the flight industry.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. I think the gentleman is making the point I was trying to make a while ago. There are about 85,000 airplanes owned by private industry, small businesses, farmers and ranchers, and I believe about 2,000 are owned by the commercial airlines. These 2,000 usually fly at 10,000 feet and upward. At 10,000 feet you can always get information on your VHF radio from an FAA station or an OMNI station up to 120 miles away. When you fly below 10,000 feet you reduce that distance or reception by about 10 miles for every 1,000 feet. Consequently, if you are flying across an area where a station is taken out and a bad weather storm comes up, and it might be one of these pilots who cannot afford a—jet star—as the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned—you would be flying at 5,000 or 6,000 feet altitude in a bad thunderstorm or bad weather area without benefit of local weather observation. The remote station that gives you information has to take it from the OMNI station that may be taken out and no one is there to give the information to you. So the coverage then is going to be done by radar or remote control, if someone might call in, that is a pilot, and reports weather information in that particular area. I have flown across areas several times and reported information to a station and then they remoted it to the main station. Maybe an hour later, the situation in that area is entirely different. I think the area has to be covered for the majority of people as well as the minority who are the high-altitude flyers.

Mr. BOLAND. I am becoming somewhat confused here. I hear the gentleman from Mississippi talk about an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation across the country and about the flight service stations, and then the gentleman from California gets up and talks about a private pilot or plane up in the clouds. The information that our committee has is that this is a station that gives weather information primarily to someone who want to fly a plane. But this information can be given just as readily by telephone. I would like to ask the gentlemen who have been talking here—is it your contention that none of these ought

to be closed anywhere in the United States—not one flight service station?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion.

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were appointed, and the Chairman appointed Mr. THOMAS and Mr. HARRIS as tellers.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 59, noes 56.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the bill is open for amendment and discussion at all points. I say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that it is not my intention to offer an amendment, but I do want to view with extreme alarm something that has happened in the bill.

Ordinarily this distinguished committee uses a surgeon's scalpel to get in and cut out all the fat, but as relates to FHA they used a meat-ax approach in this particular instance. I wish to point out that the Federal Housing Administration operates on its own money. The taxpayers do not pay for the operation of the FHA. While the gentleman is cutting back, he is cutting back on the Federal Housing Administration's use of money which it earns.

As a result, I thought it was a little extreme to cut $6 million off the operating expense of the FHA alone. The reason for that is this: the FHA—and I do not have to defend it, because all of you are for it and you know it has done a wonderful job—the FHA has had many foreclosures, and I am concerned now about these foreclosures. Most have been brought about by the closing of airfields and the moving of populations and matters of that kind. This is one organization which pays its own way and even its own administrative costs, is making a desperate effort to move the backlog of foreclosed houses which are now on the market. If you will look in your own congressional district, you will see you have some of them there. In view of the fact that it is going to take extra people for the sales effort which they are making, it seems to me to be penny wise and pound foolish to cut off the very means by which you want to cut down on the foreclosures. I would offer an amendment, but I know it is most difficult to have any success with the distinguished chairman. I have tried it before a good many times, but I really hope—and I say this sincerely—that before this bill becomes law and before the final conference report is in on it, that the distinguished members of the Committee will look to the fact that first of all you are not saving taxpayers' dollars. In the second place, you are reducing the amount of personnel and expenses that they need to relieve a backlog which you now have, and that is not good business.

Mr. Chairman, I will close my remarks at this time because I am hopeful that somewhere along the way there will be an increase in this amount so that the FHA can at least get rid of or proceed with the good job they are doing with the foreclosures.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. May I say to the gentleman that I personally appreciate his bringing this matter up. I have had some concern about the cut in the limitation on nonadministrative expenses and that is the item to which reference was made, but it must be considered that 1959, for example, was the biggest housing year in history, even bigger than 1964 and bigger than that expected in 1965, nonadministrative expenses that year were about half what they are this year. The committee really felt that they ought to slow down a little bit in some of their expenditures, and as the chairman of the subcommittee will say when he takes 5 minutes, which I hope he will, we have another explanation of this action which I think will or should, when it is brought to the attention of the gentleman from Alabama, satisfy him that there is not a member of the subcommittee who would take any single action to cripple the activities of the FHA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. RAINS. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, but you must realize the year 1959, which you said and I agree was the big housing year, was the application year. What you were doing then was this: You had people working in the various offices taking in the applications. Today you have a job fastened on the FHA by circumstances—I do not know that I can discuss what brings it about—whereby they have extra selling activities which they did not have in the year 1959. That is the point I am really concerned about. When you come to realize that you are cutting the President's request of $10 million—and this is administrative expense—you are, in fact, cutting it $6 million and you are going to be compelled to cut off about 600 or 700 people now engaged in reducing the backlog of the foreclosures which we have.

The independent offices appropriation bill as reported by the House committee would make crippling cuts in the budget of the Federal Housing Administration. It would make these cuts at a time when FHA's workloads are at peak levels and are rising, at a time when it needs all of the manpower it now has and more to keep abreast of the mounting volume of business. The House bill would reduce the manpower available below current levels.

The Federal Housing Administration has an efficient record of nearly 30 years of service to the American public. This year it has improved on its fine record and has increased its productivity and promptness of service to the public and is struggling to keep up with the mounting volume of business. Homeowners and mortgagees who pay the fees and premiums from which FHA meets all of its expenses and costs of operation are entitled to receive prompt service. The agency has to have a budget that will let it spend enough of its income to provide that kind of service.

The volume of mortgage insurance applications in the quarter ending March 31 was 17 percent above the same period a year ago. In addition, the Federal Housing Administration has increased its sales of acquired home properties to record levels in the present favorable housing market. The economy is on the rise, and we want to keep it that way. The Federal Housing Administration, with its rising volume of business, is an important element in the housing sector of the economy. It has accounted recently for approximately a third of the new homes priced at $15,000 or less and about 30 percent of homes in the $15,000 to $20,000 range. Altogether, next year the Federal Housing Administration will handle mortgage insurance applications covering about a million units of housing. Its rising workload right now is approximating that annual rate of business.

In the face of this rising volume of FHA mortgage insurance applications and the important role FHA is playing in keeping the economy of the Nation strong and on the rise, the Congress certainly cannot wish to impair FHA's ability to do its job. I am afraid, however, that that is exactly what would occur under the bill as reported. By cutting the President's request of $10,375,000 for administrative expenses to $9 million and by cutting the nonadministrative budget request of $79,750,000 to $75 million, the bill would not only deprive FHA of the increased budget that it needs to meet its increased workloads next year—it would cut the budget below the amount that the Congress made available to it last year for its operations in the current fiscal year.

Under the bill, FHA would have less manpower in fiscal year 1965 than it has now under its current appropriation act limitations, and it will have a much bigger job to do than it has had in the last fiscal year. The committee has recommended removal of the limitation on the use of fee appraisal services. This would partly offset the effect of the cut. Fee appraisals give the Agency desirable flexibility, but they are more costly, and the Agency must continue to rely mainly on its staff to handle its work. It cannot handle more business with less manpower. I am satisfied that the Agency needs the full budget requested by the President.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to direct the attention of the committee and the House to unexplainable delay and procrastination in clearing up cases before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

After the CAB approved the United Airlines-Capital Airlines merger in April 1961, the Board, on its own motion, initiated the United Airlines competitive service under docket 12837. This case was filed July 25, 1961. Two years later, on May 31, 1963, an initial decision was made by the hearing examiner recommending a pattern of competitive service. Another year has now passed with no action by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

For the past 3 years, Cleveland and the northern Ohio community have been compelled to endure one-carrier service to Chicago in the West and to New York and Philadelphia to the East. Although this has redounded to the tremendous advantage of the benefited carrier—it has enjoyed the highest passenger load factors on these routes—the adverse effect upon the public life of my community has been deplorable. The loss of business and the extent of public inconvenience because of inadequate service is incalulable.

It is absolutely inexcusable for a public agency to take up so much time in the conduct of the public business. Every additional day's delay compounds the harassment to my community to the same extent that it profits the privileged carrier which holds a monopoly on these vital routes.

I hope that this subcommittee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will investigate the unreasonable and inexcusable delay in providing vitally needed airline competition on these important routes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to ask a question of the distinguished chairman concerning Washington National Airport. There are two items in this bill totaling $5,150,000 for Washington National Airport. One is for $3,530,000 for operation and maintenance and the other is $1,620,000 for construction. The question I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas is, is there anything in this bill or any other bill of which the chairman knows which would prohibit the use of commercial short-runway jets in operating into or out of National Airport?

Mr. THOMAS. We know of no prohibition in the bill, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

I thank the gentleman for his reply, for the very simple reason that I wanted to establish some legislative history here this afternoon. I recently wrote to the Director of the FAA, Mr. Halaby, requesting that he give consideration to permitting short-runway jets to come into Nation. I can appreciate the fact that for many years during the jet age, National has been barred to the big jets because runways are too short. But now all the major airlines, as far as I know, are acquiring short-runway jets, the 727, the Caravelle, and there are some others on the drawing board.

Chicago's Midway Airport is reopening on July 5 to accommodate these short-runway jets. United Airlines is initiating jet service from Chicago's Midway Airport to New York twice a day. United Airlines, of course, has been flying its bigger jets, out of O'Hare Field for several years.

United is also initiating daily service from Midway to Washington National in their turboprop Viscounts. They are a very fine ship.

But I am sure that American and United and the other airlines would be very happy to operate their short-runway jets from Chicago's Midway to National Airport if Mr. Halaby will permit the use of National Airfield by commercial jets.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Halaby takes a completely arbitrary position on this matter. It is one for which, in my judgment, he cannot find any sound basis or sound reasoning. He gives as an excuse the fact that traffic is very heavy at National Airport and the field is not ready for jets. The fact remains, I believe, that these jets could come in here.

Mr. Chairman, La Guardia Field was recently opened to short-runway jets. It seems to me that perhaps the jet age should also catch up with the Nation's Capital. In view of the tremendous volume of traffic which moves in and out of the Nation's Capital to the Midwest, certainly these people should be entitled to fly into and out of the Nation's Capital on the short-runway jets without having to go all the way out to Dulles Airport and to Friendship Airport. The time of travel to both of these fields is too long. In both instances, it takes longer to get from the Capitol to either one of them than it does to make the flight from National Airport to Chicago by jet.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has raised a very pertinent question and I want to compliment him for his doing so. While the committee may have no information with respect to the traffic of Caravelles and that type of jet in and out of National Airport, I cannot help but believe that some force is at work to prevent it from being used by jets.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is absolutely right. The decision is completely arbitrary. It is my information that the carriers have indicated they would want to bring jets into National but the FAA gave them a flat "No." They have said they want to come into National Airport with their short-runway jets. There is nothing in the world to stop them from operating these jets into National except the FAA. They now need only 2,000-foot runways. The runways at National are more than adequate.

Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope that the Members of the House would join me in petitioning Mr. Halaby to open National Airport to short-runway jet traffic. I am sure that within a very short time we could could have a substantial service between Washington National and Chicago's Midway Airfield and that we could then cover the rest of the Midwest, including the State of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], Wisconsin, Minnesota, and all the other States.

Mr. Chairman, I say one of the things that disturbs me and worries me is the absolute power which the FAA has taken upon itself to make these arbitrary decisions, without any rhyme or reason.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when this Nation's Capital should join the jet age, in my judgment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In this case, to protect the Dulles Airport, this white elephant, losing proposition.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman. Mr. Halaby is denying short-runway jets permission to use National because he insists on forcing the airlines to use Dulles. This is the kind of Federal control which I am sure Congress never intended. I agree that Dulles is a white elephant and shall remain so for several years until volume increases enough to sustain three major airports; Friendship, Dulles, and National. But in the meantime, apparently Mr. Halaby insists that the Nation's Capital shall be bypassed by the jet age. I submit Mr. Halaby is keeping jets out of National because the people in the FAA do not want to expose their tender ears to jet noise but these same people have been oblivious to jet-noise problems in all the major cities of the country. It is my hope the FAA will withdraw its foolish opposition to using National for short-runway jets so we can develop a decent shuttle service between National and Chicago's Midway to serve the entire Midwest.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes and then I shall yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I also plan to yield to my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. Then, I shall move that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can add anything to the very learned discussion between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] and the gentleman from North Carolina about these nonadministrative expenses of the FHA.

Mr. Chairman I say to our friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], it is not our intention to hurt the FHA. Of course these are their funds. But they procure these funds by virtue of Governmenment credit. Do not forget that, by virtue of Government credit. That is what they are operating on.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any agency in Government that has had a nicer increase in jobs than they have had. Beginning in 1962, they had 7,280, and this year they wanted 9,479, in a period of 4 years. Think about it. That represents a tremendous increase. But, regardless of that, they are doing a tremendous job. They have a big workload. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] pointed out, and God bless him, he is one of the fine and able men of this Congress, and this Congress and

the United States owes him a tremendous debt for his knowledge and his ingenuity and his ability and hard work in the field of housing. But we are getting far too many foreclosures, gentlemen. He is right about that. This is due to some extent to perhaps not the best administration. There are some other causes too. Their workload is divided into two parts—putting business on the books and foreclosures, and that is divided into two parts; namely, major alterations and new starts.

I will say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] that last night I was startled to read in the Wall Street Journal that much to my surprise the new starts for April had fallen 6 percent behind.

That is not a good point, and I did not raise it to say that the workload of FHA is going down. I do not want to see it going down. That means bad times. When you do not build a new house you affect many industries in this country. But it looks like it is going down.

What we have done is this: The bill amounts to 194 jobs, Mr. JONAS, as you well remember, less than 1964 when they had a tremendous increase. We try to offset that by taking the limitation off on the number of field appraisers the FHA can use when they need them. Heretofore they could hire all the appraisers they wanted to, and the customer paid it not the FHA, but we required them to account for that in a limitation. What they estimate is 50,000 field appraisers at roughly $20 each, which is a million dollars. The 194 people are not going to cost quite a million dollars. Anyway, when we go to conference I assure you we will straighten this out.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. I would like to point out that time after time this House has been confronted with the statement, and I dare say the majority of the House would vote that way, let FHA use their own resources. But I am opposed to that. I believe the Appropriations Committee should handle that matter. When you cut a job out, when you are trying to reduce your inventory of foreclosures, it seems to me that is a little dangerous, which is the point I have in mind.

Mr. THOMAS. We are not going to let them do that.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions about this NASA appropriation at this point. I am a little confused. I tried to find out the answer by parliamentary inquiry a moment ago but was not successful. As the cahirman knows, I have an amendment to reduce the research and development funds for NASA.

Are we going to have a chance to put the question to the House at any time in the proceedings on this bill, aside from on a conference report now that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has made a point of order against this portion of the NASA appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the very able and genial gentleman from New Hampshire, and I mean that sincerely—he is one of our very able men in the House. He did not get the Phi Beta Kappa key for nothing. But as the matter stands the bill goes to conference. I say the matter will be worked out in conference. Then we bring it back to the House and under the rules of the House you can get a separate vote on the item you are interested in.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. WYMAN. Not quite. I appreciate the gentleman's very kind remarks but I do have an amendment I would like to have the House consider.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if it may not be possible, if we get the papers first, and the arrangement that has been arrived at is not satisfactory, a motion to recommit would be in order?

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is always in order.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to offer an amendment and have a chance to vote on this amendment to cut back some of the Apollo space funds until the Gemini operation has been completed. I would like to make sure that, as a Member of the House, as a member of the committee, and as a member of the subcommittee, I am going to have a chance to put this question to the House for a vote and upon debate even if it is necessary to have a NASA bill come before the House as a separate matter in a supplemental bill.

Will we have the opportunity on the conference report to put this specific question before the House for a vote?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the gentleman we cannot change the rules of the House. When we bring it back here in the form of a conference report you can offer a motion and vote it up or down.

Mr. WYMAN. Then would the gentleman from Texas say to the gentleman from Indiana that the motion to recommit would be agreed to?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot bind the conferees but such a motion is always in order.

Mr. HALLECK. A motion to recommit can be made under the rules of the House, and if it should be determined here to make such a motion to recommit, as I understand the rules, the motion to recommit could be made if we get the papers first.

Mr. WYMAN. That is on the conference report; is it not?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee about the amount that has been appropriated for payments to air carriers; that is, subsidies to local service airlines. I notice that the budget recommendation was $82,824,000. The committee allowed $79 million of that which is a reduction of some $3 million.

Now, as the gentleman knows, this is a contract authorization. I presume that appropriations must be made on the basis of the best guess as to what will be needed. The question I want to ask the gentleman is, if the committee should find that it has made an error in arriving at this particular figure, and it becomes necessary that additional funds would be needed, I would presume the committee would recommend such additional funds in a supplemental bill?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, that he has stated the situation 100 percent correctly and, of course, if there should be a deficit that will be taken care of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for this assurance. I am sure that he, as well as I, is interested in preserving the economic health and retaining the service of our local service airlines.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I notice on page 17 of the bill, a proviso that no part of the appropriation made to the Federal Trade Commission shall be used for an economic questionnaire or financial study of intercorporate relations. I do not see any such provision in connection with the Federal Power Commission appropriation. I point this out because in a recent issue of one of Washington's daily newspapers, there was carried the picture of a young lady who was posed with a 10-pound questionnaire that is being circulated by the Federal Power Commission to 114 natural gas companies. The underline to the picture says the questionnaire has been criticized by some industry spokesmen as a burden to business.

Power industry sources estimate that it will cost each company from $85,000 to $250,000 to get and fill in all the answers to this questionnaire. I wonder why the same prohibition was not applied by the committee to the Federal Power Commission appropriation as has been applied to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished friend from Iowa that the committee had no complaint from customers of the Federal Power Commission or at least they did not transmit their complaints to us. But getting back to the Federal Trade Commission, we had witnesses who asked to appear and we were delighted to have them appear and they made a very good case. Therefore, we put the limitation in the bill. It might be a fair assumption that if we had had some complaints then we would have taken similar action in the other case.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman agree with me that if it is true that it is going to cost between $85,000 and $250,000 to answer what amounts to a 10-pound questionnaire, that this is going a little bit too far?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right as usual. There is no question about that.

Mr. GROSS. I also notice the committee has increased the appropriation to the Federal Communication Commission by $710,000. I do not ask for his comment, but I will say to the gentleman I would hope that with that $710,000 additional to the Federal Communications Commission the members would be able to do something about the virtual monopoly that exists in commercial television in Austin, Tex.

(Mr. TEAGUE of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the proposed bill would impose an expenditure limitation of $257 million on the Veterans' Administration's loan guarantee revolving fund in fiscal year 1965.

Expenditures from this fund are for the payment of claims, and related expenses, resulting from defaults on VA guaranteed or insured housing loans to veterans. When private lenders make loans to wartime veterans for the purchase or construction of homes, and the VA guarantee attaches, the Government assumes legal obligations to pay valid claims of lenders which arise from defaults by the veteran borrowers.

Limitations, similar to that recommended by the Appropriations Committee for fiscal year 1965, have been imposed on the loan guarantee revolving fund in each of the past 2 years. In each of these years, it has been necessary for VA to delay payments of legal claims to lenders, because of the limitation. At present, VA is deferring payment of approximately $40 million of valid lenders' claims, pending congressional approval of an increase in the 1964 limitation from $300 to $360 million. The VA's revised estimate for fiscal year 1965 is now $352 million, compared with the $257 million limitation in the proposed bill.

Private investors are concerned about the present situation in the loan guarantee revolving fund. VA has received numerous complaints from lending institutions, as have many of us here in the Congress. In particular, the large trade associations such as the Mortgage Bankers' Association and the American Bankers' Association, have been very critical of this situation.

Since payments from this fund are made pursuant to law, an expenditure limitation can serve no useful purpose.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has recommended a reduction of $10,767,000 from the Veterans' Administration appropriation request of $102 million for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities. The committee has recommended this reduction on the basis that contractor's estimates have not been prepared, their contention being that a 10-percent reduction in the cost estimates can be effected.

The construction costs reflected in these estimates are based upon previous contract awards. These contracts reflect the Veterans' Administration's concerted effort to provide adequate construction at minimum cost. The estimates do not provide an adjustment for anticipated increases in the construction cost index nor for the inclusion of new labor saving devices and advanced medical technology. If this reduction is sustained, it will not be possible to save this amount in the cost of construction. The only alternative will be to defer or cancel specific projects in the planned program.

Included in this request are funds for the award of construction contracts for a new 1,040-bed hospital at Los Angeles, Calif.; a 720-bed replacement hospital at San Juan, P.R., and the replacement of 1,220 beds at Hines, Ill. In addition, funds are included in this request for the planning of a new facility at Chicago, Ill., and essential modernization, other improvements and research projects totaling $32 million.

The appropriation request of $102 million is the fifth increment in a 15-year program. To modernize the Veterans' Administration medical facilities, the projects included in this program have been planned and are now under development with contract awards scheduled in fiscal year 1965.

The major part of this request is for the construction of new facilities. It is important that these facilities be completed as rapidly as possible in order to prevent a drastic reduction in beds during the latter modernization phase of this program. The Veterans' Administration is exerting maximum efforts to provide these new facilities as soon as possible to meet the needs for medical care of veterans. A reduction below the request of $102 million will seriously affect the planned schedule for fiscal year 1965 and subsequent years.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WHAT CONSTITUTES DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE?

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD my observation dealing with the recognition given to Mr. Horace D. Godfrey, the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Since that time some facts have been called to my attention about the hearings, where attempts were made by the Senate committee to dig out all the facts surrounding the Billie Sol Estes case.

It seems that Mr. Godfrey repeatedly coached witnesses. Senator MUNDT protested about this practice. Chairman MCCLELLAN supported the wishes of Senator MUNDT and suggested that such coaching practices cease.

I offer for the RECORD an excerpt from page 1325 of the hearings, part IV, where one of these incidents is reported.

I would also like to submit for the permanent RECORD my previous statement.

I would pose the question: Is Mr. Godfrey being rewarded for his coaching ability?

The material referred to is as follows:

WHAT CONSTITUTES DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Mr. Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, is today being given an award for distinguished service in the Department of Agriculture. This comes as a surprise to me in view of the fact that this branch of our Department of Agriculture came under considerable criticism during the Billie Sol Estes investigation.

Lengthy hearings before a Senate subcommittee clearly revealed the confusion, the mismanagement, the lack of records, the duplication of such investigations as were conducted—and they revealed a woeful lack of management and knowledge of what was going on in the Estes case, particularly in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service headed by Mr. Godfrey. I would like to refer to the testimony of Paul Kamerick, assistant counsel of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate. This subcommittee in its attempt to get information as to the whys and wherefores of the Billie Sol Estes scandal assigned expert investigators to try to unravel the mess, and Mr. Kamerick testified:

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 22 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $500,000.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency Planning, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of the Office; $4,285,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $250,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available until ex-

pended for studies and research to develop measures and plans for telecommunications.

STATE AND LOCAL PREPAREDNESS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop State and local programs for the effective use in time of war of natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, $4,190,000.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and Technology, including services as authorized by section 15

of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $880,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Defense

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, $70,000,000, of which not to exceed $15,000,000 shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and not to exceed $13,500,000

shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions.

RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense, and for continuing shelter surveys and marking, $19,200,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the limitations on apropriations contained in Section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260).

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for civil defense activities.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service

EMERGENCY HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for carrying out emergency planning and preparedness functions of the Public Health Service, and procurement, storage (including underground storage), distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense medical supplies and equipment authorized by section 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., App. 2281 (h)), $8,500,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; $10,440,000.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, including not to exceed $3,000,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, $79,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $90,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; $21,805,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $600,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further,* That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes

or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775), $1,650,000.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3006), $10,650,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $1,138,000 of the funds in the "Employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001–3014), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS, RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3053), $14,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, without regard to the provisions of any other Act, not to exceed $348,000 of the funds in the "Retired employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3051–3060), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the estimated cost of new and increased annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided by Part III of Public Law 87–793 (76 Stat. 868), $65,000,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed $270,000 of the funds in the "Employees life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) : *Provided,* That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, the continuation of the existing authorized domestic flight service stations, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed $10,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; purchase of twelve passenger motor vehicles, including eight for replacement only; and purchase and repair of skis and snow-

shoes; $537,600,000: *Provided,* That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $6,000,000 or include in excess of 396 positions: *Provided further,* That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); and purchase of eight aircraft; $50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing

appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

For grants-in-aid for airports pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, as follows: for the purposes of section 5 (d) (4) of such Act: $66,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; for the purposes of section 5 (d) (5) of such Act, $1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; and for the purposes of section 5 (d) (6) of such Act, $7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301–1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, $21,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $3,530,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for police type use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $4,319,000.

CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, $1,620,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Dulles International Airport, $180,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Money hereafter recovered from the pool and fountain at Dulles International Airport shall not be subject to the Act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484m, 485a), and may be given to a nonprofit organization which, in the determination of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, promotes and provides for the welfare of travelers in air commerce.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed $85,400), special counsel fees, improve-

ment and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $14,500), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $16,310,000.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, $12,180,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $12,725,000: *Provided,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until

funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for an economic questionnaire or financial study of intercorporate relations.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Operating Expenses, Public Buildings Service

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; $213,800,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other removable facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its function of protecting the person of the President of the United States and his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President pursuant to Title

18, U.S.C. 3056: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation may be used to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year.

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; $90,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in con-

nection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration shall be considered to be public buildings.

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct and acquire public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of $200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including equipment for such buildings, $151,722,000, and not to exceed $500,000 of this amount shall be available to the Administrator for construction or alteration of small public buildings outside the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary, all to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

Federal office building, Centre, Alabama, $144,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Cullman, Alabama, $417,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Vernon, Alabama, $169,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Hope, Arkansas, $311,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Marshall, Arkansas, $178,100;

Post office and Federal office building, McCrory, Arkansas, $91,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Mountain Home, Arkansas, $179,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Blythe, California, $306,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Del Mar, California, $146,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Harbor City, California, $152,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Jackson, California, $255,600;

Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, in addition to the sum heretofore provided, $2,572,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Solana Beach, California, $146,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Weed, California, $126,700;

Federal office building, West Los Angeles, California, $13,101,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, $312,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Leadville, Colorado, $176,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor Locks, Connecticut, $240,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Cross City, Florida, $141,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Oakland Park Branch, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, $152,800;

Federal office building, Jacksonville, Florida, $6,266,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Gratigny Branch, Miami, Florida, $204,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Ocoee, Florida, $124,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Acworth, Georgia. $127,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Chatsworth, Georgia, $208,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Toccoa, Georgia, $282,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Warm Springs, Georgia, $70,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Arthur, Illinois, $110,600;

Federal office building, East St. Louis, Illinois, $773,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Edwardsville, Illinois, $342,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Red Bud, Illinois, $94,600;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, $1,900,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, $1,542,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Scottsburg, Indiana, $232,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Shoals, Indiana, $119,700;

Federal office building, Des Moines, Iowa, $7,931,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Scott City, Kansas, $281,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Wellington, Kansas, $259,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Clinton, Kentucky, $185,300;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Covington, Kentucky, $3,438,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Cumberland, Kentucky, $102,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Olive Hill, Kentucky, $148,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Paris, Kentucky, $218,100;

Federal office building, Richmond, Kentucky, $160,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Russell Springs, Kentucky, $86,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $3,393,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Crowley, Louisiana, $303,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Gueydan, Louisiana, $101,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Mamou, Louisiana, $72,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Mansura, Louisiana, $80,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Oberlin, Louisiana, $97,400;

Post office and courthouse, Opelousas, Louisiana, $903,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Thibodaux, Louisiana, $263,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Calais, Maine, $278,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Lubec, Maine, $104,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Machias, Maine, $220,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Centreville, Maryland, $205,000;

Post office and Federal office building, North East, Maryland, $114,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Prince Frederick, Maryland, $185,900;

Central heating plant, Suitland, Maryland, $3,213,000;

General Services Administration, Federal records center, Boston, Massachusetts, $883,800;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Boston-Lawrence area, Massachusetts, $3,748,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Marlboro, Massachusetts, $242,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Milford, Massachusetts, $274,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, $2,704,500;

Internal Revenue Service National Administrative Service Center and Regional Training Center Building, Detroit, Michigan, $2,925,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Lawton, Michigan, $89,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Mancelona, Michigan, $94,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Baudette, Minnesota, $159,700;

Courthouse and Federal office building, St. Paul, Minnestota, $8,993,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Bay Springs, Mississippi, $154,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Coldwater, Mississippi, $83,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Port Gibson, Mississippi, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Richton, Mississippi, $80,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Branson, Missouri, $142,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Crystal City, Missouri, $125,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Montgomery City, Missouri, $248,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Fullerton, Nebraska, $178,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Gothenburg, Nebraska, $147,800;

Post office and courthouse, Carson City, Nevada, $1,889,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Berlin, New Hampshire, $317,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Avenel, New Jersey, $133,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Burlington, New Jersey, $261,800;

Federal office building, Newark, New Jersey, $12,121,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Raton, New Mexico, $319,000;

Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $11,034,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Keeseville, New York, $106,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Andrews, North Carolina, $105,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Cary, North Carolina, $111,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Jacksonville, North Carolina, $274,700;

Federal office building, Kinston, North Carolina, $164,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Mars Hill, North Carolina, $101,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Raeford, North Carolina, $226,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Rich Square, North Carolina, $87,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Waynesville, North Carolina, $401,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor, North Carolina, $151,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Hillsboro, Ohio, $337,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Mantua, Ohio, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Afton, Oklahoma, $107,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Elk City, Oklahoma, $222,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Hugo, Oklahoma, $269,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Jay, Oklahoma, $174,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Baker, Oregon, $1,117,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Enterprise, Oregon, $195,900;

Post office and Federal office building, Prineville. Oregon, $252,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Scappoose, Oregon, $125,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Berwick, Pennsylvania, $267,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Brookeville, Pennsylvania, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Dallas, Pennsylvania, $151,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Duncannon, Pennsylvania, $92,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Falls Creek. Pennsylvania, $96,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Galeton, Pennsylvania, $119,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Hawley, Pennsylvania, $151,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Irwin, Pennsylvania, $224,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Montrose, Pennsylvania, $151,700;

Post office and Federal office building, New Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Cedarhurst Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Green Tree Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Pleasant Hills Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Youngsville, Pennsylvania, $96,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Humacao, Puerto Rico, $181,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Olneyville Station, Providence, Rhode Island, $235,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Elloree, South Carolina, $87,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Ridgeland, South Carolina, $246,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Williston, South Carolina, $91,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Oneida, Tennessee, $131,800;

Post office and Federal office building, Buffalo, Texas, $86,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Carthage, Texas, $235,600;

Post office and Federal office building, Fairfield, Texas, $168,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Gonzales, Texas, $224,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Naples, Texas, $104,100;

Post office and Federal office building, Sulphur Springs, Texas, $279,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Heber, Utah, $161,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Provo, Utah, $378,000;

Post office and Federal office building, St. Johnsbury, Vermont, $335,000;

Franconia warehouse building, Franconia, Virginia, $5,800,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Cle Elum, Washington, $120,200;

Federal office building, Colville, Washington, $393,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Newport, Washington, $136,700;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Spokane, Washington, $6,385,500;

Federal office building, Vancouver, Washington, $426,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Gassaway, West Virginia, $115,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenville, West Virginia, $159,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Parsons, West Virginia, $171,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Pineville, West Virginia, $157,500;

Post office and Federal office building, Summersville, West Virginia, $232,200;

Post office and Federal office building, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, $129,300;

Post office and Federal office building, Eagle River, Wisconsin, $152,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Elroy, Wisconsin, $113,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Horicon, Wisconsin, $120,800;

Housing and Home Finance Agency building, District of Columbia, $26,027,100:

Provided further, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum: *Provided further,* That the amount of $840,300 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1961 and 1962, for projects at Vanceboro, Maine, Pembina, North Dakota, and Wyandotte, Michigan, is hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation, and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the Post Office and Federal office building at Augusta, Maine, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, is hereby increased by $460,000.

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the

Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), $9,885,000.

EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to provide, directly or indirectly, additional space for the United States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and furnishings; $1,030,600.

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system (including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and other supply management and related activities, as authorized by law, $48,920,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, UTILIZATION AND DISPOSAL SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property, and rehabilitation of personal property, as authorized by law, $9,512,500, to be derived from proceeds from the

transfer of excess property and the disposal of surplus property.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, $14,955,000, including $25,000 which shall be available for continuing to carry out the purposes of Sec. 2 of Public Law 88–195 approved December 11, 1963, for the period ending June 30, 1965.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation, communications, and other public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $5,465,000.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h), during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including

charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), not to exceed $1,500,000 for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including reimbursement for security guard services, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $2,875,000 for operating expenses, $17,755,000, to be derived from sales of strategic and critical materials: *Provided,* That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Act provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accord-

ance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further*, That any receipts from sales during the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury except as otherwise provided herein: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and, after compliance with the disposal requirements of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, excess materials in the national stockpile established pursuant to that Act, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, $1,505,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $500 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (78 Stat. 153), $400,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $310,000: *Provided,* That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund: *Provided,* That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further,* That the total amount deposited into said account for the current fiscal year from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed $19,565,000: *Provided*

further, That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Appropriations to the General Services Administration

under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" made in this Act shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under that appropriation: *Provided,* That nothing herein shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be in-

creased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided,* That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose space for any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies at an estimated cost of construction in excess of $200,000 or for the payment of the salary of any person who executes such a lease agreement: *Provided,* That the foregoing proviso

shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for the lease construction of space has been submitted to and approved by the appropriate Committees of the Congress in the same manner as for public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $15,525,000: *Provided,* That during the current fiscal year non-administrative expenses, as defined by law (77 Stat. 437), shall not exceed $3,250,000.

Urban Planning Grants

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $2,350,000.

Urban Studies and Housing Research

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, $387,400.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, MASS TRANSPORTATION DEMONSTRATIONS

For necessary expenses in connection with mass transportation demonstration projects, as authorized by section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $100,000.

OPEN SPACE LAND GRANTS

For expenses in connection with grants to aid in the acquisition of open-space land or interests therein, and with the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), $15,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $262,000 may be used for administrative expenses and technical assistance, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with grants requiring payments in excess of the amount herein appropriated therefor.

PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), $1,000,000, together with such additional sums not to exceed $3,000,000 as may be necessary to restore to said revolving fund the amounts which are not required to be repaid pursuant to section 702 (g) of the Housing Act of 1954,

as added by section 6 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (40 U.S.C. 462g), to be immediately available.

URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $200,000,000.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), $25,000,000.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), $200,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, $15,484,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; and purchase of not to exceed thirty-six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $25,260,000, of which not less than $1,889,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $1,261,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided,* That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Operation and Maintenance of Properties

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, $37,000: *Provided,* That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further,* That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $420,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the government for research without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $2,600,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $14,680,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $38,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; $39,440,000: *Provided,*

That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for and recognition of war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; reimbursement of the Department of the Army for the services of the officer assigned to the Veterans Administration to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; $155,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, as authorized by law, $14,200,000.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $36,000,000, of which $1,170,000 shall be for prosthetic research and development activities.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational articles and facilities; maintenance, operation and acquisition of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase

of eighty-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code; $1,115,935,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided,* That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, burial flags, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, and for payment of amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C. 2677 of tort claims

potentially subject to the offset provisions of 38 U.S.C. 351, $3,963,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as saved from repeal by section 12 (a) of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1264), and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, $34,600,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, $13,700,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, $91,233,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital

and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Texas, is reduced from "$2,000,000" to "$1,990,000".

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, $310,000.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed $257,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided,* That the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Re-

adjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

The appropriation available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board, to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission

as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

LIMITATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Not to exceed a total of $3,670,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which may procure services as authorized by section

15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and contracts for such services with one organization may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances therefor in accordance with the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131–2133), and said amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided,* That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 6 (i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and

retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further,* That expenses of any functions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449) : *Provided further,* That the nonadministrative expenses (except those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed $13,120,000 for not to exceed 1,000 positions.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $225,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730a).

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Not to exceed $1,900,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed $1,220,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $110,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Not to exceed $915,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the

Federal home-loan banks and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed $8,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That the distribution

of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $9,000,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed $1,500): *Provided further,* That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed $75,000,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433), including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5

U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further,* That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed $1,420,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided,* That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program

(including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1965".

Passed the House of Representatives May 21, 1964.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

MAY 22 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C. 20250
Official business Postage and fees paid
U. S. Department of Agriculture

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued July 28, 1964
For actions of July 27, 1964
88th-2nd; No. 143

CONTENTS

Agricultural land.....1	Economy.....15	National park.....1,10
Appalachia.....12	Education.....6	Poverty.....11
Appropriations.....7	Ethics.....20	Public lands.....8
ASC Committeemen.....1	Fisheries.....18	Reclamation.....4
Cantaloups.....14	Flour.....9	Recreation.....5
Containers.....2	Foreign aid.....19	Saline water.....17
Corn.....13	Lands.....4,8	Taxes.....16
Crop insurance.....1	Meat imports.....3	Wheat.....9

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee voted to report bills to: Extend technical help in community projects; Increase crop-insurance counties; and re election and function of ASC committeemen. Senate began debate on bill with meat-import restrictions. Senate subcommittees voted to report independent offices appropriation bill and Public Land Review Commission bill.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 5406, with amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States in planning changes in use of agricultural land; H. R. 9178, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act regarding election and functioning of ASC committeemen; S. 277, to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered; and H. R. 8290, with amendment, to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park. p. D593

2. CONTAINERS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 6413, to permit the sale in D.C. of milk and ice cream and other frozen dairy products in smaller containers than now permitted. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16400

SENATE

3. MEAT IMPORTS. Began debate on H. R. 1839, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, including an amendment which would impose quotas on the importation of meat and meat products. pp. 16495-505

4. RECLAMATION. Both Houses received a letter from Interior reporting that a soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Clear Creek South Unit, Trinity River Division, Central Valley project, Calif., and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops. pp. 16420, 16421

   The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee approved for full committee consideration the Moss substitute to S. 1658, authorizing construction and operation of the Central Arizona project, Arizona and New Mexico. p. D592

5. RECREATION. Sen. Douglas urged approval of S. 2249, to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and inserted an editorial praising the bill as "a realistic and workable compromise." pp. 16438-9

6. EDUCATION. Sen. Hartke inserted a letter praising the work-study provisions of S. 2490, the college student assistance bill. p. 16439

7. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved with amendments for full committee consideration H. R. 11296, the independent offices appropriation bill. p. D592

8. PUBLIC LANDS. The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved with amendments for full committee consideration H. R. 8070, to establish a Public Land Law Review Commission, and H. R. 5498, authorizing the sale of public lands not needed for Federal program requirements. p. D592

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

9. WHEAT; FLOUR. Rep. Findley inserted an article, "Freeman Blunders on Wheat, Flour Prices..." pp. A3904-5

10. NATIONAL PARK. Extension of remarks of Rep. McFall inserting Rep. Johnson's speech in which he traced the history of Yosemite National Park. pp. A3906-7

11. POVERTY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Pucinski inserting an article "which clearly and concisely marshals the arguments as to why President Johnson's bold program to reduce poverty in this country is urgently needed." pp. A3907-8

12. APPALACHIA. Extension of remarks of Rep. Schwengel inserting excerpts from a radio interview in which Rep. Mahon expressed his opinion that the proposed Appalachian bill is "too ambitious." p. A3910

13. CORN. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hartke praising the development of a high-protein corn and inserting an editorial noting the great possibilities for use of this corn in underdeveloped nations. pp. A3893-4

14. CANTALOUPS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Yarborough and insertion of an article praising the qualities of Pecos Valley, Tex., cantaloups. p. A3896

15. ECONOMY. Rep. Udall inserted an article outlining the posture of the Nation's economy. pp. A3897-9

16. TAXES. Sen. Johnston and Rep. Pucinski inserted an article by Paul Samuelson showing the salutary effects on the economy of the tax cut. pp. A3900-1, A3903

15. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1965. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H.R. 11296 (S. Rept. 1269). p. D611

ITEMS IN THE APPENDIX

16. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Zablocki praising the foreign aid program and inserting an editorial indicating the extent to which U.S. aid allowed the Republic of China to become self-supporting. p. A4001

17. POVERTY. Reps. Goodell and Berry inserted a series of articles critical of the poverty bill. pp. A4003-6, A4031

18. RECREATION. Rep. Henderson inserted a speech by George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director, National Park Service, in which he favored the land and water conservation fund. pp. A4009-10

19. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Randall stating that "because of REA today farmers live better" and inserting an essay outlining benefits from REA. p. A4014

20. WATER RESOURCES. Rep. Teague inserted an editorial critical of Gov. Brown's (Calif.) "handling of regional water proposals involving the State" and urging support for S. 2760, to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest. p. A4015

BILLS INTRODUCED

21. ADMIN. PROCEDURES. H.R. 12145 by Rep. Fascell, to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the United States; to Judiciary Committee. Remarks of author, pp. 16885-6

22. SUGAR. H.R. 12148 by Rep. Hagen, to extend and amend provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to Agriculture Committee.

23. POVERTY. H.R. 12152, by Rep. Pirnie, to establish a National Human Resources Development Commission; to Education and Labor Committee

24. DISASTER RELIEF. H.R. 12159, by Rep. Mathias, to indemnify dairy farmers; to Agriculture Committee.

H.R. 12160, by Rep. Mathias, to provide additional drought disaster relief by reimbursement of one-half the cost of shipment of hay; to Agriculture Committee.

H.R. 12161, by Rep. Mathias, to eliminate the test of financial need as a prerequisite for the sale of feed for livestock in emergency areas; to Agriculture Committee.

H.R. 12162, by Rep. Mathias, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make economic disaster loans; to the Agriculture Committee.

25. HOUSING. H.R. 12175, by Rep. Rains, and H.R. 12177, by Rep. Widnall, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; to Banking and Currency Committee.

26. FOOD COUPONS. H.R. 12176, by Rep. Rostenkowski, to amend the Social Security Act to provide for Federal financial participation in payments withheld at the request of recipients of assistance under the Federal-State public assistance programs for the purchase of food coupons; to Ways and Means Committee.

O

COMMITTEE HEARINGS JULY 31:
Public Law 480 operations, H. Agriculture (exec.). Foreign aid appropriations, S. Appropriations. Appalachian bill, H. Public Works (exec.).

oOo

Calendar No. 1206

88TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 1269

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

JULY 30, 1964.—Ordered to be printed under authority of the order of the Senate of July 30, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11296]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House	$8, 091, 698, 000
Amount of increase by Senate	5, 494, 258, 500
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	13, 585, 956, 500
Amount of appropriations, 1964	13, 242, 600, 550
Amount of budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	14, 221, 511, 400

The bill as reported to the Senate:

Under the estimates for 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	635, 554, 900
Over the appropriations for 1964	343, 355, 950

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill provides a total amount of $13,585,956,500 which is $343,355,950 over the appropriations for 1964, $635,554,900 under the estimates for 1965, and an increase of $5,494,258,500 over the House bill.

This unusual increase over the House bill results from the need to restore over $5 billion in funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which were stricken by a point of order on the House floor due to lack of authorization at that time.

The committee recommendations are based upon the estimates considered by the House, in House Documents 195, 203, 240, and 304, as well as estimates submitted to the Senate in Senate Documents 73 and 81.

The committee recommends $8,013,000 over the budget estimates, for the following:

Civil Aeronautics Board, payments to air carriers:	
To pay 1964 obligations for subsidies still unfunded	$2,000,000
To conform to Board order fixing helicopter subsidy rates	1,300,000
General Services Administration: Sites and expenses, adding 2 projects anticipating approval of 11(b) reports in public works committees	3,700,000
Veterans' Administration: Additions to medical research	1,013,000
Total over budget estimates	8,013,000

Summaries for the 26 agencies in the bill, in comparision with the budget estimates and the House allowances, are shown in the following table, and the tabulation by items of appropriations is included at the end of the report.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES FOR AGENCIES IN THE BILL

Agency	Budget estimates, 1965	Recommended in House bill	Senate recommendation
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$525,000	$500,000	$500,000
Office of Emergency Planning	13,700,000	9,975,000	10,545,000
Disaster Relief	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Office of Science and Technology	950,000	880,000	950,000
Civil defense, Department of Defense	358,000,000	89,200,000	154,200,000
Civil defense, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	9,507,000	8,500,000	9,250,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	93,599,000	89,440,000	96,899,000
Civil Service Commission	115,025,000	114,505,000	114,887,000
Federal Aviation Agency	831,850,000	775,249,000	818,999,000
Federal Communications Commission	16,610,000	16,310,000	16,460,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	(17,233,000)	(16,790,000)	(16,945,000)
Federal Power Commission	13,335,000	12,180,000	12,699,000
Federal Trade Commission	13,270,000	12,725,000	13,025,000
General Services Administration	603,387,400	537,992,600	595,613,100
Housing and Home Finance Agency	665,360,000	477,846,400	478,896,400
Federal National Mortgage Association	(8,800,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)
Federal Housing Administration	(90,125,000)	(84,000,000)	(89,125,000)
Public Housing Administration	(18,275,000)	(16,904,000)	(17,504,000)
Interstate Commerce Commission	25,850,000	25,260,000	25,710,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,445,000,000		5,300,000,000
National Capital Housing Authority	37,000	37,000	37,000
National Science Foundation	487,620,000	420,400,000	420,400,000
Renegotiation Board	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Securities and Exchange Commission	15,325,000	14,680,000	14,680,000
Selective Service System	43,020,000	39,440,000	40,578,000
Veterans' Administration	5,446,941,000	5,423,978,000	5,439,028,000
Total	14,221,511,400	8,091,698,000	13,585,956,500

Personal Property

It is the feeling of the committee that the agencies included in this bill have not made maximum use of excess personal property available through the General Services Administration. The committee urges all agencies to make vigorous efforts during the coming year to utilize General Services Administration property and when fiscal year 1966 budget estimates are justified to make a report on accomplishments and comparisons with previous years.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Emergency Planning

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	$4,695,000
Estimate, 1965	5,700,000
House allowance	4,285,000
Committee recommendation	4,855,000

The committee recommends restoration of $570,000, to provide a total amount of $4,855,000 for salaries and expenses, which is $845,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends restoration of $350,000 to the limitation for studies and research, to provide a total amount of $600,000 to develop measures and plans for emergency preparedness and telecommunications, which is $700,000 below the budget estimate.

Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization Functions of Federal Agencies

1964 appropriations	$4,190,000
Estimate, 1965	6,500,000
House allowance	4,190,000
Committee recommendation	4,190,000

The committee agrees with the House in providing $4,190,000 to carry out civil defense and defense mobilization functions delegated to Federal agencies by Executive order, which is $2,310,000 less than the budget estimate and continues the present level of appropriation for another year. The committee believes, as stated last year, that this fund should finance only essential responsibilities delegated by Executive orders in civil defense and emergency preparedness for which an agency has no statutory responsibility, and that agencies should not expect additional funds for tasks they would normally be expected to perform without a specific delegation.

Office of Science and Technology

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	$880,000
Estimate, 1965	950,000
House allowance	880,000
Committee recommendation	950,000

Restoration of $70,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $950,000 for the Office of Science and Technology, to provide advisory assistance and staff support to the President in developing policies and evaluating programs in science and technology, with the aid of consultants in the fields of science and engineering.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Defense

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

1964 appropriations	$70, 319, 000
Estimate, 1965	92, 400, 000
House allowance	70, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	85, 000, 000

The committee recommends restoration of $15 million, to provide a total amount of $85 million for the operation and maintenance of civil defense, which is $7,400,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends restoration of $2 million, to provide a total amount of $17 million for the limitation on funds available for personnel and administrative expense assistance to States and local organizations under section 205, which is $1,700,000 below the budget estimate.

Deletion is recommended by the committee of the limitation on management expenses to $13,500,000 and 1,000 positions. The committee is advised that such restriction establishes rigidity in operation of the agency which is detrimental to the program and leads to inefficiency in the expenditure of funds. The committee believes that latitude should be granted to use the funds appropriated in the manner which will best serve changing needs

Research, Shelter Survey and Marking

1964 appropriations	$41, 250, 000
Estimate, 1965 (authorized portion of $265,600,000)	142, 300, 000
House allowance	19, 200, 000
Committee recommendation	69, 200, 000

The committee recommends restoration of $50 million, to provide a total amount of $69,200,000 for research, shelter survey, and marking, which is $73,100,000 below the estimate for authorized programs.

Of the $50 million restoration, $30 million is recommended for procurement of standard shelter provisions for stocking additional shelter spaces; $500,000 is recommended for practical research on portable ventilation kits, to examine all possibilities before setting up a procurement program at what seems to be an excessive cost per unit; $4,500,000 is recommended for water storage equipment; $5 million is recommended for the identification of existing fallout protection in structures such as private home basements and small buildings not previously covered by the national shelter survey; and $10 million is recommended to provide professional community planning services to local governments to help establish a workable shelter system which will include the assignment of individuals to specific shelters.

The committee agrees with the House in providing $10 million for research and development, which is $5 million below the budget estimate.

Authorization for stocking the shelters is recommended by the committee.

The committee recommends deletion of the general provision prohibiting the use of funds for construction of fallout shelters.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service

EMERGENCY HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1964 appropriations	$27,500,000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $32,000 in H. Doc. 240)	9,507,000
House allowance	8,500,000
Committee recommendation	9,250,000

Restoration of $750,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $9,250,000 for emergency health activities, which is $257,000 below the budget estimate.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$10,240,000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $25,000 in H. Doc. 240)	10,775,000
House allowance	10,440,000
Committee recommendation	10,775,000

The committee recommends restoration of $335,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $10,775,000 for salaries and expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in order to fully fund 14 current positions as well as add 12 new positions in safety activities.

Payments to Air Carriers

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

1964 appropriations (including deficiency of $4,000,000)	$83,000,000
Estimate, 1965	82,824,000
House allowance	79,000,000
Committee recommendation	86,124,000

The committee recommends an increase of $7,124,000, to provide a total amount of $86,124,000 for payments to air carriers, which is $3,300,000 over the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends an increase of $1,300,000, to provide a total amount of $4,300,000 for the limitation on subsidy for helicopter operations, which is $1,300,000 over the budget estimate. The committee was advised that the Civil Aeronautics Board on February 20, 1964, issued an order fixing subsidy rates for the three helicopter carriers aggregating $4,300,000 a year, based on its determination of such rates in accordance with section 406 of the act. The committee was further advised that any further significant contraction in the levels of service would render the helicopter experiment of little value.

Of the amount of $3,300,000 by which the appropriation recommended is over the budget estimate, $1,300,000 is the additional amount recommended for helicopter subsidies, and $2 million is to pay the 1964 obligations for subsidies that are still unfunded.

The committee expects for the next fiscal year to completely examine the problem of subsidies to helicopter operations, with a view to discontinuing them altogether, or to determine if expanded operations are warranted.

In comments last year on subsidy payments to local service airlines, this committee restated the intent of Congress that the ocst of this public service must be weighed against the public benefits derived. The committee also declared that the Civil Aeronautics Board had a duty to encourage, develop and foster the orderly growth of air transportation for smaller cities. The committee believes that the Board's attempt to reduce subsidy payments is commendable and we encourage it. However, the committee believes that subsidy reduction should be based not on artificial or arbitrary cutbacks in service, but affirmative Board policies which will strengthen these carriers' operations so that their own efficiencies will generate further reductions.

The committee is concerned over possible increases in subsidy resulting from the Board's policy of relieving trunk carriers of their obligations to serve small cities and permitting local service airlines to take over trunkline routes. While the committee agrees that it is beneficial to local service airlines to strengthen their route structure, it does not believe that this should be accomplished by increasing subsidy. The Board has been unable to furnish this committee with any facts to prove that its policy has or will result in subsidy reductions. In many instances the Board admits that substantial increases in subsidy have occurred. The committee believes that the Board should exercise caution in this area. The Board should either insist that the carriers concerned furnish clear evidence that there will be no increase in subsidy as a result of substituting a local service airline for a trunk carrier or should condition the award of the route on its ineligibility for subsidy.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$21, 805, 000
Estimate, 1965	22, 187, 000
House allowance	21, 805, 000
Committee recommendation	22, 187, 000

Restoration of $382,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $22,187,000 for salaries and expenses of the Civil Service Commission.

Employees Life Insurance Fund

(administrative expense limitation)

1964 limitation	($270, 000)
Estimate, 1965	(277, 000)
House allowance	(270, 000)
Committee recommendation	(277, 000)

The committee recommends restoration of $7,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $277,000 for the administrative expense limitation from the employees life insurance fund.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Operations

1964 appropriations	$528, 000, 000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $1,400,000 in H. Doc. 240)	547, 600, 000
House allowance	537, 600, 000
Committee recommendation	544, 100, 000

Restoration of $6,500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $544,100,000 for operations of the Federal Aviation Agency, which is $3,500,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends deletion of the requirement for the continuation of the existing authorized domestic flight service stations.

Authorization is recommended by the committee for the purchase of 16 passenger motor vehicles, including 12 for replacement only.

In the limitation for total costs of aviation medicine, the committee recommends restoring the full budget estimate of $6,344,000 and 406 positions.

Facilities and Equipment

1964 appropriations	$100, 250, 000
Estimate, 1965	75, 000, 000
House allowance	50, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	66, 000, 000

The committee recommends restoration of $16 million, to provide a total amount of $66 million for facilities and equipment, which is $9 million below the budget estimate.

Research and Development

1964 appropriations	$40, 000, 000
Estimate, 1965	42, 000, 000
House allowance	21, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	42, 000, 000

Restoration of $21 million is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $42 million for research and development.

Operation and Maintenance, Washington National Airport

1964 appropriations	$3, 581, 500
Estimate, 1965	3, 631, 000
House allowance	3, 530, 000
Committee recommendation	3, 600, 000

Restoration of $70,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $3,600,000 for operation and maintenance of Washington National Airport, which is $31,000 below the budget estimate. The restoration is for the procurement of a snow removal unit.

Construction, Washington National Airport

1964 appropriations	$2, 075, 000
Estimate, 1965	1, 800, 000
House allowance	1, 620, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 800, 000

The committee recommends restoration of $180,000 to provide the full budget estimate of $1,800,000 for construction at Washington National Airport. The committee is advised that the full budget estimate is required to secure a useful replacement for hangar No. 10.

General Provision

The committee recommends inserting a provision authorizing reimbursement for funds expended in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$15,600,000
Estimate, 1965	16,610,000
House allowance	16,310,000
Committee recommendation	16,460,000

Restoration of $150,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $16,460,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, which is $150,000 below the budget estimate.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Administrative Expenses Limitation

1964 appropriations	($2,430,000)
Estimate, 1965	(3,825,000)
House allowance	(3,670,000)
Committee recommendation	(3,825,000)

The committee recommends restoration of $155,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $3,825,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$11,850,000
Estimate, 1965	13,335,000
House allowance	12,180,000
Committee recommendation	12,699,000

Restoration of $519,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $12,699,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Power Commission, which is $636,000 below the budget estimate.

In its report on the 1964 independent offices appropriations bill, the committee specified that no funds be spent by the FPC to establish regulatory authority over REA cooperatives until the Congress had an opportunity to consider pending legislation clarifying the intent of Congress on this subject. The Commission disregarded the committee's wishes and expended considerable sums of money in a proceeding, docket No. E–7113, in which three REA cooperatives were ordered to show cause why they should not be regulated by the FPC. Hearings on a bill to make Congress intent clear have been held by the Senate Commerce Committee and the bill is before that committee for consideration. Due to the lateness of the session action may not be concluded this calendar year. This committee still firmly believes that any question concerning the assertion of additional Federal regulatory authority over REA cooperatives by the FPC should await the decision of the Congress on pending legislation. Therefore, the committee repeats that no funds should be used by FPC to establish its regulatory authority over REA cooperatives until the Congress has had ample opportunity to consider the question. The committee hopes that the Commission will not choose to defy its wishes again this year.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$12, 214, 750
Estimate, 1965	13, 270, 000
House allowance	12, 725, 000
Committee recommendation	13, 025, 000

Restoration of $300,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $13,025,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, which is $245,000 below the budget estimate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Operating Expenses, Public Buildings Service

1964 appropriations	$210, 875, 000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $325,000 in H. Doc. 240)	224, 570, 000
House allowance	213, 800, 000
Committee recommendation	224, 570, 000

The committee recommends restoration of $10,770,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $224,570,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service.

Deletion is recommended by the committee of the proviso prohibiting the use of this appropriation to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to GSA to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year. The committee is advised that, while such a change in space funding policy would be agreeable for fiscal year 1966, the agencies involved did not include funds in their budgets for such costs in 1965 and it is doubtful if they could absorb the costs.

The committee is of the opinion that in comparing costs for award of contracts for displacement of existing utility services, recognition should be given to all costs normally borne by nongovernmental suppliers.

Construction, Public Buildings Projects

1964 appropriations	$157, 600, 000
Estimate, 1965	169, 613, 400
House allowance	151, 722, 000
Committee recommendation	161, 247, 500

The committee recommends a total appropriation of $161,247,500 for construction, public buildings projects, which is an increase of $9,525,500 over the House allowance and $8,365,900 below the budget estimate.

The amount recommended is arrived at as follows:

House allowance	$151, 722, 000
Restoration of fallout protection	1, 445, 000
Restoration of half of the House reduction of 10 percent	8, 080, 500
Senate recommendation	161, 247, 500

To conform to the recommendation for restoration of the amount for fallout shelters in Federal buildings, the committee recommends inserting "fallout shelters therein" in the authorizing language for the item.

Details of the individual projects as recommended by the Senate committee, in comparison with the estimate and the House allowance, are set forth in the following table:

Location of project	Construction estimate with fallout shelters 100 percent	House allowance 90 percent without fallout shelters	Senate recommendation 95 percent with fallout shelter
Centre, Ala	$160,900	$144,800	$152,850
Cullman, Ala	463,500	417,200	440,350
Vernon, Ala	188,800	169,900	179,300
Hope, Ark	346,300	311,700	329,000
Marshall, Ark	197,900	178,100	188,000
McCrory, Ark	102,000	91,800	96,900
Mountain Home, Ark	199,800	179,800	189,800
Blythe, Calif	340,300	306,300	323,300
Del Mar, Calif	162,200	146,000	154,100
Harbor City, Calif	169,400	152,500	160,950
Jackson, Calif	284,000	255,600	269,800
Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, Calif	2,858,000	2,572,200	2,715,100
Solana Beach, Calif	162,200	146,600	154,100
Weed, Calif	140,800	126,700	133,750
West Los Angeles, Calif	14,660,000	13,101,300	13,932,150
Glenwood Springs, Colo	346,800	312,100	329,450
Leadville, Colo	196,000	176,400	186,200
Windsor Locks, Conn	267,400	240,700	254,050
Cross City, Fla	157,400	141,700	149,550
Fort Lauderdale, Fla	169,800	152,800	161,300
Jacksonville, Fla	7,079,500	6,266,300	6,731,400
Miami, Fla	227,100	204,400	215,750
Ocoee, Fla	138,160	124,300	131,200
Acworth, Ga	141,100	127,000	134,050
Chatsworth, Ga	231,500	208,400	219,950
Toccoa, Ga	314,000	282,600	298,300
Warm Springs, Ga	78,000	70,200	74,100
Arthur, Ill	122,900	110,600	116,750
East St. Louis, Ill	896,700	773,700	853,700
Edwardsville, Ill	381,000	342,900	361,950
Red Bud, Ill	105,100	94,600	99,850
Evansville, Ind. (courthouse and Federal office building)	2,193,000	1,900,800	2,087,400
Evansville, Ind. (post office and Federal office building)	1,786,000	1,542,600	1,700,300
Scottsburg, Ind	258,800	232,900	245,850
Shoals, Ind	133,000	119,700	126,350
Des Moines, Iowa	8,932,000	7,931,700	8,491,350
Scott City, Kans	312,200	281,000	296,600
Wellington, Kans	288,000	259,200	273,600
Clinton, Ky	205,900	185,300	195,600
Covington, Ky	3,820,000	3,438,000	3,629,000
Cumberland, Ky	113,600	102,200	107,900
Olive Hill, Ky	164,900	148,400	156,650
Paris, Ky	242,300	218,100	230,200
Richmond, Ky	178,700	160,800	169,750
Russell Springs, Ky	95,700	86,100	90,900
Baton Rouge, La	3,864,000	3,393,000	3,675,500
Crowley, La	337,200	303,500	320,350
Gueydan, La	112,900	101,600	106,200
Mamou, La	80,000	72,000	76,000
Mansura, La	89,200	80,300	84,750
Oberlin, La	108,200	97,400	102,800
Opelousas, La	1,055,000	903,600	1,004,800
Thibodaux, La	292,800	263,500	278,150
Calais, Maine	309,100	278,200	293,650
Lubec, Maine	116,100	104,500	110,300
Machias, Maine	245,100	220,600	232,850
Centreville, Md	227,800	205,000	217,000
North East, Md	127,600	114,800	121,200
Prince Frederick, Md	206,600	185,900	196,250
Suitland, Md	3,570,000	3,213,000	3,341,500
Boston, Mass	982,000	883,800	932,900
Boston-Lawrence, Mass	4,165,000	3,748,500	3,956,750
Marlboro, Mass	269,800	242,800	256,300
Milford, Mass	305,100	274,600	289,850
Springfield, Mass	3,105,000	2,704,500	2,954,750
Detroit, Mich	3,250,000	2,925,000	3,087,500
Lawton, Mich	98,900	89,000	93,950
Mancelona, Mich	104,500	94,100	99,300
Baudette, Minn	177,400	159,700	168,550
St. Paul, Minn	10,120,000	8,993,300	9,620,150
Bay Springs, Miss	172,000	154,800	163,400
Coldwater, Miss	92,800	83,500	88,150
Port Gibson, Miss	171,600	154,400	163,000
Richton, Miss	89,700	80,700	85,200
Branson, Mo	158,000	142,200	150,100
Crystal City, Mo	139,900	125,900	132,900
Montgomery City, Mo	275,500	248,000	261,750
Fullerton, Nebr	198,500	178,700	188,600
Gothenburg, Nebr	164,200	147,800	156,000
Carson City, Nev	2,166,000	1,889,100	2,061,050
Berlin, N.H	352,200	317,000	334,006

Location of project	Construction estimate with fallout shelters 100 percent	House allowance 90 percent without fallout shelters	Senate recommendation 95 percent with fallout shelter
Avenel, N.J	$148,000	$133,200	$140,600
Burlington, N.J	290,900	261,800	276,350
Newark, N.J	13,577,000	12,121,200	12,903,600
Raton, N. Mex	354,400	319,000	336,900
Buffalo, N.Y	12,372,000	11,034,900	11,758,950
Keeseville, N.Y	117,900	106,100	112,000
Andrews, N.C	116,800	105,100	110,950
Cary, N.C	124,000	111,600	117,800
Jacksonville, N.C	305,200	274,700	289,950
Kinston, N.C	182,500	164,300	173,400
Mars Hill, N.C	113,000	101,700	107,350
Raeford, N.C	252,100	226,900	239,500
Rich Square, N.C	97,000	87,300	92,250
Waynesville, N.C	445,600	401,000	423,300
Windsor, N.C	167,900	151,100	159,500
Hillsboro, Ohio	374,800	337,300	356,050
Mantua, Ohio	171,600	154,400	163,000
Afton, Okla	119,200	107,300	113,250
Elk City, Okla	247,100	222,400	234,750
Hugo, Okla	299,400	269,500	284,450
Jay, Okla	194,200	174,800	184,500
Baker, Oreg	1,301,000	1,117,800	1,238,900
Enterprise, Oreg	217,700	195,900	206,800
Prineville, Oreg	280,300	252,300	266,300
Scappoose, Oreg	139,700	125,700	132,700
Berwick, Pa	297,600	267,800	282,700
Brookville, Pa	171,600	154,400	163,000
Dallas, Pa	168,500	151,700	160,100
Duncannon, Pa	102,500	92,300	97,400
Falls Creek, Pa	107,400	96,700	102,050
Galeton, Pa	132,800	119,500	126,150
Hawley, Pa	168,500	151,700	160,100
Irwin, Pa	249,300	224,400	236,850
Montrose, Pa	168,500	151,700	160,100
New Bethlehem, Pa	171,600	154,400	163,000
Pittsburgh, Pa.:			
Cedarhurst Branch	202,600	182,300	192,450
Green Tree Branch	202,600	182,300	192,450
Pleasant Hills Branch	202,600	182,300	192,450
Youngsville, Pa	107,400	96,700	107,050
Humacao, P.R	201,400	181,300	191,350
Providence, R.I	261,400	235,300	248,350
Elloree, S.C	97,100	87,400	92,250
Ridgeland, S.C	273,900	246,500	260,200
Williston, S.C	102,000	91,800	96,900
Oneida, Tenn	146,400	131,800	139,100
Buffalo, Tex	95,600	86,000	90,800
Carthage, Tex	261,800	235,600	248,700
Fairfield, Tex	187,400	168,700	178,050
Gonzales, Tex	248,900	224,000	236,450
Naples, Tex	115,700	104,100	109,900
Sulphur Springs, Tex	310,500	279,500	295,000
Heber, Utah	179,200	161,300	170,250
Provo, Utah	420,000	378,000	399,000
St. Johnsbury, Vt	372,200	335,000	353,600
Cle Elum, Wash	133,600	120,200	126,900
Colville, Wash	436,900	393,200	415,050
Newport, Wash	151,900	136,700	144,300
Spokane, Wash	7,212,000	6,385,500	6,857,250
Vancouver, Wash	473,900	426,500	450,200
Gassaway, W. Va	128,000	115,200	121,600
Glenville, W. Va	177,000	159,300	168,150
Parsons, W. Va	190,200	171,200	180,700
Pineville, W. Va	175,000	157,500	166,250
Summersville, W. Va	258,000	232,200	245,100
White Sulphur Springs, W. Va	143,700	129,300	136,500
Eagle River, Wis	169,700	152,700	161,200
Elroy, Wis	126,000	113,400	119,700
Horicon, Wis	134,200	120,800	127,500
Washington, D.C	29,000,000	26,027,100	27,554,050

SUMMARY FOR COMPARISON OF TOTALS

	Amount in budget estimate	Amount in House bill	Senate recommendation
Ashtabula, Ohio	$195,000		
Franconia, Va. (warehouse)	5,800,000	$5,800,000	$5,800,000
Small projects outside District of Columbia	500,000	500,000	500,000
Adjustments in previously funded projects	−840,300	−840,300	−840,300
Total	169,613,400	151,722,000	161,247,500

The committee also recommends increasing the cost limit for the border station facility at Derby Line, Vt., by $183,000.

As requested in Senate Document No. 73, the committee also recommends inserting transfer authority to "Construction, U.S. Mission Building, New York, N.Y.," for the payment of additional contractor's claims, in the amount of not to exceed $120,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Sites and Expenses, Public Building Projects

1964 appropriations	$40,000,000
Estimates, 1965	29,500,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	33,200,000

The committee recommends inserting the item for "Sites and expenses, public building projects," in the amount of the estimate for 41 approved projects of $29,500,000, and has added two projects which it is anticipated are shortly to be authorized by the approval of 11(b) reports (Shreveport, La., at $1,600,000, and Lincoln, Nebr., at $2,100,000). The total amount recommended is $33,200,000, which is $3,700,000 over the budget estimate.

The 43 projects funded are indicated on the following table.:

Approved projects proposed under the 1965 estimate for sites and expenses

[In thousands]

Project	Sites and expenses	Improvements	Total
Alabama:			
Mobile, Federal office building	$735	$5,430	$6,165
Talladega, post office and Federal office building	114	340	454
Arkansas: Magnolia, post office and Federal office building	83	315	398
California:			
Lawndale, Federal Aviation Agency building	460	5,640	6,100
Sacramento, Federal office building	1,050	5,882	6,932
Van Nuys, Federal office building	678	1,799	2,477
Less: Amount in 1964 appropriation	−342		−342
Unfunded	336	1,799	2,135
Georgia:			
Athens, post office and Federal office building	540	2,272	2,812
Valdosta, post office and courthouse	429	2,118	2,547
Idaho:			
Moscow, post office and courthouse	452	1,287	1,739
St. Maries, post office and Federal office building	210	884	1,094
Less: Amount in 1964 appropriation	−116		−116
Unfunded	94	884	978

Approved projects proposed under the 1965 estimate for sites and expenses—Continued

[In thousands]

Project	Sites and expenses	Improvements	Total
Indiana:			
Hammond, post office and courthouse (construction and remodeling)	$163	$678	$841
Indianapolis, Federal office building	2,746	10,892	13,638
Indianapolis, post office and courthouse (construction and remodeling)	129	1,407	1,536
Kentucky: Frankfort, courthouse and Federal office building	575	1,725	2,300
Maine:			
Portland, post office and Federal office building (extension and remodeling)	111	1,380	1,491
Rockland, post office and Federal office building	162	399	561
Michigan: Grand Rapids, courthouse and Federal office building	1,783	4,419	6,202
Missouri:			
Cape Girardeau, courthouse and Federal office building [1]	273	1,429	1,702
St. Louis, Federal office building	858	13,517	14,375
Montana: Butte, courthouse and Federal office building (construction and remodeling)	64	643	707
New Hampshire: Newmarket, post office and Federal office building	85	225	310
New Mexico: Gallup, Federal office building	447	2,804	3,251
New York: Albany, Federal office building	1,472	7,052	8,524
North Carolina:			
Goldsboro, Federal office building	59	606	665
Oxford, post office and Federal office building	119	409	528
Trenton, post office and Federal office building	46	134	180
Tennessee: Dyersburg, post office and courthouse (extension)	63	387	450
Texas:			
Big Spring, post office and Federal office building	380	987	1,367
McAllen, border patrol sector headquarters	71	689	760
Pearsall, post office and Federal office building	92	179	271
Utah: St. George, Federal office building	86	179	265
Vermont:			
Brattleboro, post office, courthouse, and Federal office building (extension and remodeling)	166	606	772
Rutland, post office, courthouse, and Federal office building (extension and remodeling)	153	645	798
Washington: Seattle, Federal office building	2,705	21,552	24,257
West Virginia: Mount Hope, Mines (extension and remodeling)	38	305	343
Wyoming:			
Casper, post office and Federal office building	1,319	3,859	5,178
Casper, post office and courthouse (construction and remodeling)	53	522	575
Washington, D.C.:			
General Services Administration Building	1,092	19,805	20,897
Department of Labor Building	5,968	38,037	44,005
Tax Court Building	2,022	7,826	9,848
National Science Foundation (extension and remodeling)	309	4,222	4,531
Subtotal, 41 projects	27,902	173,486	201,388
Program development and administrative operations	1,600		
Total	29,502		
Rounded	29,500		
Added by Senate committee:			
Louisiana: Shreveport, post office and Federal office building	1,600	2,830	4,430
Nebraska: Lincoln, courthouse and Federal office building	2,100	12,500	14,600
Total appropriation for sites and expenses	33,200		

[1] Approved by Senate Public Works Committee only.

Operating Expenses, Federal Supply Service

1964 appropriations	$46,000,000
Estimated, 1965 (reduced $715,000 in H. Doc. 240)	54,085,000
House allowance	48,920,000
Committee recommendation	52,420,000

The committee recommends restoration of $3,500,000, to provide a total amount of $52,420,000 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service, which is $1,665,000 below the budget estimate.

Operating Expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service

(INDEFINITE APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS)

1964 appropriation	($9, 387, 500)
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $98,000 in H. Doc. 240)	(10, 052, 000)
House allowance	(9, 512, 500)
Committee recommendation	(9, 512, 500)

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $9,512,500 for operating expenses of the Utilization and Disposal Service, which is $539,500 below the budget estimate.

Operating Expenses, National Archives and Record Service

1964 appropriations	$14, 730, 000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $90,000 in H. Doc. 240)	15, 410, 000
House allowance	14, 955, 000
Committee recommendation	15, 155, 000

Restoration of $200,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $15,155,000 for operating expenses of the National Archives and Record Service, which is $255,000 below the budget estimate.

Operating Expenses, Transportation and Communication Service

1964 appropriations	$4, 850, 000
Estimate, 1965	6, 000, 000
House allowance	5, 465, 000
Committee recommendation	5, 765, 000

The committee recommends restoration of $300,000, to provide a total amount of $5,765,000 for operating expenses of the Transportation and Communication Service, which is $235,000 below the budget estimate.

Strategic and Critical Materials

(INDEFINITE APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS)

1964 appropriations	($23, 925, 000)
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $140,000 in H. Doc. 240)	(18, 090, 000)
House allowance	(17, 755, 000)
Committee recommendation	(17, 755, 000)

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $17,755,000 for necessary expenses to be derived from the sales of strategic and critical materials for carrying out the provisions of the act, which is $335,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends restoration of $125,000 to provide the full budget estimate of $3 million for the limitation on operating expenses.

Office of the Administrator

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	$1, 438, 000
Estimate, 1965	1, 550, 000
House allowance	1, 505, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 530, 000

Restoration of $25,000 is recommended by the committee to provide a total amount of $1,530,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator, which is $20,000 below the budget estimate.

Presidential Transition

1964 appropriations	
Estimate, 1965 (Budget amendment in H. Doc. 304)	$800,000
House allowance	400,000
Committee recommendation	400,000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $400,000 for carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 7, 1964, which is $400,000 below the budget estimate.

Limitation on Administrative Operations Fund

1964 appropriations	($18,150,000)
Estimate, 1965	(21,840,000)
House allowance	(19,565,000)
Committee recommendation	(21,840,000)

Restoration of $2,275,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate for the limitation on the administrative operations fund.

Working Capital Fund

1964 appropriations	
Estimate, 1965	$200,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	100,000

The committee recommends inserting the item for working capital fund in the amount of $100,000, which is $100,000 below the budget estimate, in order to provide for consolidating certain printing and duplicating plants. The committee is advised that particular emphasis is placed on providing centralized duplicating facilities for all tenants at the time new Federal office buildings are occupied.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	$15,525,000
Estimate, 1965	16,915,000
House allowance	15,525,000
Committee recommendation	15,925,000

Restoration of $400,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $15,925,000 for salaries and expenses of the Administrator, which is $990,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee further recommends authorization for the purchase of a medium sedan at not to exceed $4,000.

Restoration of $250,000 is also recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $3,500,000 for the nonadministrative expense limitation, which is $200,000 below the budget estimate.

URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

1964 appropriations	$387,400
Estimate, 1965	1,500,000
House allowance	387,400
Committee recommendation	387,400

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $387,400 for urban studies and housing research, which is $1,112,600 below the budget estimate.

Mass Transportation Demonstrations

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	($195,000)
Estimate, 1965	200,000
House allowance	100,000
Committee recommendation	100,000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $100,000 for administrative expenses for mass transportation demonstration projects, which is $100,000 below the budget estimate.

Open-Space Land Grants

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATION

1964 appropriations	($262,000)
Estimate, 1965	(400,000)
House allowance	(262,000)
Committee recommendation	(262,000)

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $262,000 for the administrative expense limitation for open space land grants, which is $138,000 below the budget estimate.

Low-Income Housing Demonstrations

1964 appropriations	$1,200,000
Estimate, 1965	5,075,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	50,000

The committee recommends inserting the item for administrative expenses of low income housing demonstrations in the amount of $50,000. The committee is advised that an extension of the program is recommended in the 1964 housing bill, and is recommending this minimum amount in order to keep current work active until a legislative decision is made.

Public Housing Administration

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	$15,484,000
Estimate, 1965	16,670,000
House allowance	15,484,000
Committee recommendation	16,084,000

Restoration of $600,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $16,084,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, which is $586,000 below the budget estimate.

Public Facility Loans

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	($1,220,000)
Estimate, 1965	(1,300,000)
House allowance	(1,220,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,220,000)

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $1,220,000 for the administrative expense limitation on the public facility loan program, which is $80,000 below the budget estimate.

Housing for the Elderly

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	($885,000)
Estimate, 1965	(1,150,000)
House allowance	(915,000)
Committee recommendation	(915,000)

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $915,000 for the limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the housing for the elderly loan program, which is $235,000 below the budget estimate.

Federal Housing Administration

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1964 appropriations	($9,500,000)
Estimate, 1965	(10,375,000)
House allowance	(9,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(10,375,000)

Restoration is recommended by the committee of $1,375,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $10,375,000 for administrative expense limitation of the Federal Housing Administration.

LIMITATION ON NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

1964 appropriation	($76,565,000)
Estimate, 1965	(79,750,000)
House allowance	(75,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(78,750,000)

The committee recommends restoration of $3,750,000, to provide a total amount of $78,750,000 for the nonadministrative expense limitation of the Federal Housing Administration which is $1,000,000 below the budget estimate. The committee is advised that the full amount is required in order to conduct an economical and increasingly efficient operation with a rising workload.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$24,670,000
Estimate, 1965	25,850,000
House allowance	25,260,000
Committee recommendation	25,710,000

Restoration of $450,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $25,710,000 for salaries and expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is $140,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends an increase of 2 in the authorization for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement, to provide a total of 38.

The committee recommends that within the funds provided the Commission establish a motor carrier office in the State of Wyoming. The committee is advised that the work of the Commission in Wyoming has increased to the point that an office in that State can be justified.

During the hearings the committee received testimony on the need for additional Commission field staff to combat illegal carriage. The committee believes that primary emphasis must be placed on a coordinated, cooperative effort of the Commission, private industry, and the States in any successful enforcement program to curb illegal carriage. State highway patrols do not have the specialized knowledge to cope with all types of unlawful carriers whose operations are often masked by ingenious schemes, devices and techniques. The Commission is urged to devote more of its resources in a coordinated, cooperative effort against this serious problem confronting our national transportation system.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends inserting in the bill the items for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These items were stricken on the floor of the House on a point of order which was sustained for lack of authorization. Since that time the authorization has been finally enacted, in the total amount of $5,227,506,000, for fiscal year 1965.

A supplemental request in House Document 203, dated January 21, 1964, in the amount of $141 million, is not yet funded. The request was based upon authorizations enacted for 1964, and states:

> These additional funds are needed to continue the development and procurement of certain long leadtime items at the rate required, so that the manned space flight program may go forward to achieve the goal of a manned lunar landing within this decade. The principal items requiring additional amounts in 1964 are the lunar excursion module and associated components of the Apollo spacecraft, $31 million, and the Saturn V launch vehicle, $110 million.

Research and Development

1964 appropriations	$3, 926, 000, 000
Estimate, 1965 (including $141,000,000 in H. Doc. 203)	4, 523, 000, 000
House allowance (reported at $4,345,000,000)	----------
Authorization, 1965	4, 341, 100, 000
Committee recommendation	4, 413, 594, 000

The full amount of the 1965 authorization of $4,341,100,000 is recommended by the committee for research and development, and the committee recommends adding thereto $72,494,000 of the $141 million requested from the 1964 authorization, to provide a total amount of $4,413,594,000, which is $109,406,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee examined in some detail the budgeting for aeronautical research programs included in the bill. Aeronautical research and development funding has been deemphasized in recent years compared to the impetus provided for the space sciences and space hardware. The committee urges the NASA to reevaluate its aeronautical research programs in order to bring its vast resources to bear in those areas in which the NASA because of its particular competence can push back the frontiers of aeronautical science. New emphasis on aeronautical research and development is clearly indi-

cated in view of the technological challenges confronting U.S. industries from foreign aeronautical achievements in recent years. The committee does not believe that in the brief 60-year history of aviation all the problems of safety, economics, and technology have been solved. The committee is confident that new and even greater breakthroughs in aeronautical science can and will be achieved if sufficient time, energy, and money is devoted to their attainment. Advances yet to be made in aeronautical sciences will, in the committee's opinion, have as great an influence on the future economy of our Nation as any other branch of industrial technology.

The committee is most encouraged to learn that NASA and some of its centers are seriously considering the use of space boosters which are being developed by the Department of Defense as part of the national space booster program. It is the view of the committee that this is the best and most economical use of our national assets. The committee urges NASA to continue to coordinate its efforts with the Department of Defense in order to make maximum use of space boosters already under development. In light of the constant assurance the committee has received that NASA frequently and closely coordinates its efforts with the Department of Defense, it is hoped that NASA will continue this cooperative effort rather than pursue a policy of developing its own boosters.

The committee wishes to encourage NASA to continue and improve their work on methods of recovery of the booster portions of the various types of space vehicles and feels that such efforts could lead to great potential savings in the space program.

Construction of Facilities

1964 appropriations	$680, 000, 000
Estimate, 1965	281, 000, 000
House allowance (reported at $245,000,000)	----------
Authorization, 1965	262, 880, 500
Committee recommendation	262, 880, 500

The committee recommends the full amount of the authorization of $262,880,500 for construction of facilities, which is $18,119,500 below the budget estimate.

Administrative Operations

1964 appropriations	$494, 000, 000
Estimate, 1965	641, 000, 000
House allowance (reported at $610,000,000)	----------
Authorization, 1965	623, 525, 500
Committee recommendation	623, 525, 500

The committee recommends the full amount of the authorization of $623,525,500 for administrative operations, which is $17,474,500 below the budget estimate.

Authorization for the purchase of 85 passenger motor vehicles, of which 40 shall be for replacement, is recommended by the committee.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$353, 200, 000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $80,000 in H. Doc. 240)	487, 620, 000
House allowance	420, 400, 000
Committee recommendation	420, 400, 000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $420,400,000 for salaries and expenses of the National Science Foundation, which is $67,220,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee recommends inserting authorization for the purchase (of one), maintenance and operation, and hire of aircraft. The committee is advised that the aircraft will be used at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in their fundamental research on the atmosphere, which promises to lead to significant scientific results and economic benefits. Also, that among their scientific programs the research on clouds could lead to new theories of weather modification.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations	$13, 937, 500
Estimate, 1965 (includes $100,000 budget amendment in H. Doc. 304)	15, 325, 000
House allowance	14, 680, 000
Committee recommendation	14, 680, 000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $14,680,000 for salaries and expenses of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which is $645,000 below the budget estimate.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses

1964 appropriations (includes deficiency of $2,638,000)	$40, 578, 000
Estimate, 1965	43, 020, 000
House allowance	39, 440, 000
Committee recommendation	40, 578, 000

Restoration of $1,138,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the 1964 level of $40,578,000 for salaries and expenses of the Selective Service System, which is $2,442,000 below the budget estimate.

Authorization for the hire of motor vehicles is recommended by the committee, to allow for the leasing of one medium sedan, as authorized by Budget Bureau Circular A–22.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

1964 appropriations	$159,750,000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $1,000,000 in H. Doc. 240)	155,524,000
House allowance	155,000,000
Committee recommendation	155,250,000

Restoration of $250,000 is recommended by the committee to provide a total amount of $155,250,000 for general operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration, which is $274,000 below the budget estimate.

Medical Administration and Miscellaneous Operating Expenses

1964 appropriations	$14,800,000
Estimate, 1965 (reduced $30,000 in H. Doc. 240)	14,885,000
House allowance	14,200,000
Committee recommendation	14,500,000

The committee recommends restoration of $300,000 to provide a total amount of $14,500,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses, which is $385,000 below the budget estimate.

Medical and Prosthetic Research

1964 appropriations	$33,742,000
Estimate, 1965	36,987,000
House allowance	36,000,000
Committee recommendation	38,000,000

The committee recommends a total amount of $38 million for medical and prosthetic research, which is $2 million over the House allowance and $1,013,000 over the budget estimate. The committee believes that many fields of VA medical research can use additional funds to good advantage, and should be kept ahead of rising cost of salaries, supplies and equipment.

The committee recommends increasing the earmarking for prosthetic research and development activities to $1,275,000, as requested.

Readjustment Benefits

1964 appropriations	$67,000,000
Estimate, 1965	39,600,000
House allowance	34,600,000
Committee recommendation	39,600,000

Restoration of $5 million is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $39,600,000 for readjustment benefits.

Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities

1964 appropriations	$76,976,000
Estimate, 1965 (includes additional $5,000,000 in S. Doc. 81)	107,000,000
House allowance	91,233,000
Committee recommendation	98,733,000

The committee recommends restoration of $7,500,000 to provide a total amount of $98,733,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities, which is $8,267,000 below the budget estimate. The restoration is intended for alteration of existing facilities to provide 2,000 nursing home beds at various VA hospitals, as requested in Senate Document 81, and to restoration of the reduction in construction cost estimates.

Two years ago the House Committee on Appropriations recommended, and this committee agreed with that recommendation, that $1,722,000 previously appropriated for technical services for Bay Pines, Fla., remain earmarked looking toward new construction at that site if and when the Administrator deems it in the public interest to begin such construction. The committee requests that such funds remain so earmarked.

Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund

The committee recommends deletion of the limitation of $257 million on the availability of the loan guaranty revolving fund for expenses for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations. The committee is advised that such expenses are now running at the rate of $380 million, and will continue at that rate through 1965.

The committee also recommends inserting a proviso authorizing, as requested in Senate Document 84, transfer of up to $200 million of unobligated balances of the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund.

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Appropriation estimates, 1964	Appropriation estimates, 1965	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	$89,000	$89,000	----------
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property	1,200,000	1,200,000	----------
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations	1,289,000	1,289,000	----------

Note.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1964 budget document for 1965. Subject to further revision.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965	Recommended in bill for House, 1965	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965	House bill
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:							
Administrative expenses	($2,430,000)	[1] ($3,825,000)	($3,670,000)	($3,825,000)	(+$1,395,000)	----------	(+$155,000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(12,800,000)	[2] (13,408,000)	(13,120,000)	(13,120,000)	(+320,000)	(−$288,000)	
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	(1,315,000)	(225,000)	(225,000)	(225,000)	(−1,090,000)	----------	----------
Housing and Home Finance Agency:							
College housing loans	(1,903,000)	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)	(−3,000)	----------	----------
Public facility loans	(1,220,000)	(1,300,000)	(1,220,000)	(1,220,000)	----------	(−80,000)	----------
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(135,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(−25,000)	----------	----------
Housing for the elderly	(885,000)	(1,150,000)	(915,000)	(915,000)	(+30,000)	(−235,000)	----------
Federal National Mortgage Association	(8,750,000)	(8,800,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)	(−250,000)	(−300,000)	----------
Federal Housing Administration:							
Administrative expenses	(9,500,000)	(10,375,000)	(9,000,000)	(10,375,000)	(+875,000)	----------	(+1,375,000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(76,565,000)	(79,750,000)	(75,000,000)	(78,750,000)	(+2,185,000)	(−1,000,000)	(+3,750,000)
Public Housing Administration:							
Administrative expenses	(15,484,000)	(16,670,000)	(15,484,000)	(16,084,000)	(+600,000)	(−586,000)	(+600,000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(1,420,000)	(16,105,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	----------	(−185,000)	----------
Total, administrative expenses	(132,407,000)	(139,118,000)	(130,564,000)	(136,444,000)	(+4,037,000)	(−2,674,000)	(+5,880,000)

[1] Reflects reduction of $65,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[2] Reflects reduction of $35,000 in H. Doc. 240.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1964 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1965

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	House bill
TITLE I							
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL							
Salaries and expenses	$525,000	$525,000	$500,000	$500,000	−$25,000	−$25,000	
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING							
Salaries and expenses	4,695,000	5,700,000	4,285,000	4,855,000	+160,000	−845,000	+$570,000
State and local preparedness	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000			
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies	4,190,000	6,500,000	4,190,000	4,190,000		−2,310,000	
Total, Office of Emergency Planning	10,385,000	13,700,000	9,975,000	10,545,000	+160,000	−3,155,000	+570,000
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY							
Salaries and expenses	880,000	950,000	880,000	950,000	+70,000		+70,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	11,790,000	15,175,000	11,355,000	11,995,000	+205,000	−3,180,000	+640,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
Disaster relief	[1] 70,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	−50,000,000		

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE							
CIVIL DEFENSE							
Operation and maintenance	70,319,000	92,400,000	70,000,000	85,000,000	+15,319,000	−7,400,000	+15,000,000
Research, shelter survey and marking	41,250,000		19,200,000	69,200,000	+27,950,000	+69,200,000	+50,000,000
Shelter, construction, and researeh and development		265,600,000				−265,600,000	
Total, Civil Dcfense, Department of Defense	111,569,000	358,000,000	89,200,000	154,200,000	+42,631,000	−203,800,000	+65,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
Emergency health activities	27,500,000	[2] 9,507,000	8,500,000	9,250,000	−18,250,000	−257.000	+750,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES							
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD							
Salaries and expenses	10,240,000	[3] 10,775,000	10,440,000	10,775,000	+535,000		+335,000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization)	[4] 83,000,000	82,824,000	79,000,000	86,124,000	+3,124,000	+3,300,000	+7,124,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	93,240,000	93,599,000	89,440,000	96,899.000	+3,659,000	+3,300,000	+7,459,000
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	21,805,000	22,187,000	21,805,000	22,187,000	+382,000		+382,000
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations	600,000	634,000	600,000	600,000		−34,000	
Annuities under special acts	1,800,000	1,700,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	−150,000	−50,000	
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund	9,500,000	10,664,000	10,650,000	10,650,000	+1,150,000	−14,000	
Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund	14,800,000	14,840,000	14,800,000	14,800,000		−40,000	
Payment to civil serviee retirement and disability fund	62,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	+3,000,000		
Administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund (limitation)	*(270,000)*	*(277,000)*	*(270,000)*	*(277,000)*	*(+7,000)*		*(+7,000)*
Total, Civil Service Commission	110,505,000	115,025,000	114,505,600	114,887,000	+4,382,000	−138,000	+382.000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 28.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	House bill
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY							
Operations	$528,000,000	[5] $547,600,000	$537,600,000	$544,100,000	+$16,100,000	−$3,500,000	+$6,500,000
Facilities and equipment	100,250,000	75,000,000	50,000,000	66,000,000	−34,250,000	−9,000,000	+16,000,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)	20,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	−13,000,000		
Grants-in-aid for airports, 1965		[6] 75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+75,000,000		
Grants-in-aid for airports, 1966		[6] 75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+75,000,000		
Research and development	40,000,000	42,000,000	21,000,000	42,000,000	+2,000,000		+21,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	3,581,500	3,631,000	3,530,000	3,600,000	+18,500	−31,000	+70,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	3,985,000	4,619,000	4,319,000	4,319,000	+334,000	−300,000	
Construction, Washington National Airport	2,075,000	1,800,000	1,620,000	1,800,000	−275,000		+180,000
Construction, Dulles International Airport	450,000	200,000	180,000	180,000	−270,000	−20,000	
Civil supersonic aircraft development	60,000,000				−60,000,000		
Total, Federal Aviation Agency	758,341,500	831,850,000	775,249,000	818,999,000	+60,657,500	−12,851,000	+43,750,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	15,600,000	16,610,000	16,310,000	16,460,000	+860,000	−150,000	+150,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	11,850,000	13,335,000	12,180,000	12,699,000	+849,000	−636,000	+519,000

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	12,214,750	13,270,000	12,725,000	13,025,000	+810,250	−245,000	+300,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION							
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	210,875,000	[7] 224,570,000	213,800,000	224,570,000	+13,695,000		+10,770,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings	75,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	+15,000,000		
Construction, public buildings projects	157,600,800	169,613,400	151,722,000	161,247,500	+3,646,700	−8,365,900	+9,525,500
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	40,000,000	29,500,000		33,200,000	−6,800,000	+3,700,000	+33,200,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	5,200,000	[8] 9,885,000	9,885,000	9,885,000	+4,685,000		
Expenses, U.S. court facilities	1,030,600	1,464,000	1,030,600	1,030,600		−433,400	
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	46,000,000	[9] 54,085,000	48,920,000	52,420,000	+6,420,000	−1,665,000	+3,500,000
General supply fund	30,000,000				−30,000,000		
Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	*(9,387,500)*	[10] *(10,052,000)*	*(9,512,500)*	*(9,512,500)*	*(+125,000)*	*(−539,500)*	
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	14,730,000	[11] 15,410,000	14,955,000	15,155,000	+425,000	−255,000	+200,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	4,850,000	6,000,000	5,465,000	5,765,000	+915,000	−235,000	+300,000
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	*(23,925,000)*	[12] *(18,090,000)*	*(17,755,000)*	*(17,755,000)*	*(−6,170,000)*	*(−335,000)*	
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1,438,000	1,550,000	1,505,000	1,530,000	+92,000	−20,000	+25,000
Expenses, Presidential transition		[13] 800,000	400,000	400,000	+400,000	−400,000	
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	300,000	310,000	310,000	310,000	+10,000		
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	*(18,150,000)*	*(21,840,000)*	*(19,565,000)*	*(21,840,000)*	*(+3,690,000)*		*(+2,275,000)*
Working capital fund		200,000		100,000	+100,000	−100,000	+100,000
Total, General Services Administration	587,024,400	603,387,400	537,992,600	595,613,100	+8,588,700	−7,774,300	+57,620,500

See footnotes at end of table, p. 28.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	House bill
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY							
Office of the Administrator:							
Salaries and expenses	$15,525,000	$16,915,000	$15,525,000	$15,925,000	+$400,000	−$990,000	+$400,000
Urban planning grants	21,150,000	25,000,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	−18,800,000	−22,650,000	
Urban studies and housing research	387,400	1,500,000	387,400	387,400		−1,112,600	
Mass transportation demonstration grants	5,000,000				−5,000,000		
Administrative expenses, mass transportation demonstration	(*195,000*)	200,000	100,000	100,000	+100,000	−100,000	
Open-space land grants	15,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000		−15,000,000	
Low-income housing demonstration programs	1,200,000	5,075,000		50,000	−1,150,000	−5,025,000	+50,000
Public works planning fund	2,000,000	[1] 16,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+2,000,000	−12,000,000	
Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization)	100,000,000	265,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	+100,000,000	−65,000,000	
Housing for the elderly fund	100,000,000	75,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	−75,000,000	−50,000,000	
Total, Office of the Administrator	260,262,400	434,690,000	262,362,400	262,812,400	+2,550,000	−171,877,600	+450,000
Public Housing Administration:							
Annual contributions	197,000,000	214,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	+3,000,000	−14,000,000	
Administrative expenses	15,484,000	16,670,000	15,484,000	16,084,000	+600,000	−586,000	+600,000
Total, Public Housing Administration	212,484,000	230,670,000	215,484,000	216,084,000	+3,600,000	−14,586,000	+600,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	472,746,400	635,360,000	477,846,400	478,896,400	+6,150,000	−186,463,600	+1,050,000

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	24,670,000	25,850,000	25,260,000	25,710,000	+1,040,000	−140,000	+450,000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION							
Research and development	3,926,000,000	[15] 4,523,000,000		4,413,594,000	+487,594,000	−109,406,000	+4,413,594,000
Construction of facilities	680,000,000	281,000,000		262,880,500	−417,119,500	−18,119,500	+262,880,500
Administrative operations	494,000,000	641,000,000		623,525,500	+129,525,500	−17,474,500	+623,525,500
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,100,000,000	5,445,000,000		5,300,000,000	+200,000,000	−145,000,000	+5,300,000,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY							
Operation and maintenance of properties	43,000	37,000	37,000	37,000	−6,000		
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION							
Salaries and expenses	353,200,000	[16] 487,620,000	420,400,000	420,400,000	+67,200,000	−67,220,000	
RENEGOTIATION BOARD							
Salaries and expenses	2,550,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	+50,000		
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	13,937,500	[17] 15,325,000	14,680,000	14,680,000	+742,500	−645,000	
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM							
Salaries and expenses	[18] 40,578,000	43,020,000	39,440,000	40,578,000		−2,442,000	+1,138,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION							
General operating expenses	159,750,000	[19] 155,524,000	155,000,000	155,250,000	−4,500,000	−274,000	+250,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	14,800,000	[20] 14,885,000	14,200,000	14,500,000	−300,000	−385,000	+300,000
Medical and prosthetic research	33,742,000	36,987,000	36,000,000	38,000,000	+4,258,000	+1,013,000	+2,000,000
Medical care	[21] 1,091,643,000	1,115,935,000	1,115,935,000	1,115,935,000	+24,292,000		
Compensation and pensions	[22] 3,951,000,000	3,963,000,000	3,963,000,000	3,963,000,000	+12,000,000		
Readjustment benefits	67,000,000	39,600,000	34,600,000	39,600,000	−27,400,000		+5,000,000
Veterans' insurance and indemnities	30,200,000	13,700,000	13,700,000	13,700,000	−16,500,000		

See footnotes at end of table, p. 28.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	Recommended in the House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	House bill
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—Continued							
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	$76,796,000	[23] $107,000,000	$91,233,000	$98,733,000	+$21,937,000	−$8,267,000	+$7,500,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	310,000	310,000	310,000	310,000			
Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund		[24]					
Loan guaranty revolving fund (limitation on obligations)	[25] *(360,000,000)*	[26] Indefinite	*(257,000,000)*	Indefinite	*(−360,000,000)*		*(−257,000,000)*
Total, Veterans' Administration	5,425,241,000	5,446,941,000	5,423,978,000	5,439,028,000	+13,787,000	−7,913,000	+15,050,000
Total, definite appropriations	13,242,600,550	[27] 14,221,511,400	8,091,698,000	13,585,956,500	+343,355,950	−635,554,900	5,494,258,500
Total, indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales)	33,312,500	28,142,000	27,267,500	27,267,500	−6,045,000	−874,500	
Total appropriations, title I	13,275,913,050	[27] 14,249,653,400	8,118,965,500	13,613,224,000	+337,310,950	−634,680,400	+5,494,258,500

[1] Includes $50,000,000 in Public Law 88-296, approved Apr. 7, 1964.
[2] Reflects reduction of $32,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[3] Reflects reduction of $25,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[4] Includes $4,000,000 in Deficiency Act (Public Law 88-317).
[5] Reflects reduction of $1,400,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[6] Submitted in H. Doc. 195.
[7] Reflects reduction of $325,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[8] Reflects reduction of $465,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[9] Reflects reduction of $715,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[10] Reflects reduction of $98,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[11] Reflects reduction of $90,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[12] Reflects reduction of $140,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[13] Submitted in H. Doc. 304.
[14] Includes $4,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 203.
[15] Includes $141,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 203.
[16] Reflects reduction of $80,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[17] Includes $100,000 contained in H. Doc. 304.
[18] Includes $2,638,000 in Deficiency Act (Public Law 88-317).
[19] Reflects reduction of $1,000,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[20] Reflects reduction of $30,000 in H. Doc. 240.
[21] Includes $10,457,000 in Deficiency Act (Public Law 88-317).
[22] Includes $30,000,000 in Deficiency Act (Public Law 88-317).
[23] Includes $5,000,000 contained in S. Doc. No. 81.
[24] Language to reduce new obligational authority by $150,000,000.
[25] Includes $60,000,000 in Deficiency Act (Public Law 88-317).
[26] Budget amendment in S. Doc. No. 84 adds proviso to transfer not to exceed $200,000,000 from direct loans revolving fund.
[27] Includes $145,000,000 for 1964 supplementals.

Calendar No. 1206

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

[Report No. 1269]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 22 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 30, 1964
Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of July 30, 1964, by Mr. MAGNUSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $500,000.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency Planning, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of the Office; ~~$4,285,000~~ *$4,855,000*: *Provided,* That not to exceed ~~$250,000~~ *$600,000* of the foregoing amount shall remain available until expended for studies and research to

develop measures and plans for *emergency preparedness and* telecommunications.

STATE AND LOCAL PREPAREDNESS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop State and local programs for the effective use in time of war of natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, $4,190,000.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and Technology, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates

for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, ~~$880,000~~ *$950,000.*

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Defense

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, ~~$70,000,000~~ *$85,000,000,* of which not to exceed ~~$15,000,000~~ *$17,000,000* shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended~~, and not to exceed $13,500,000 shall be available for management~~

~~expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions.~~

RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense, and for continuing shelter surveys ~~and marking~~, *marking and stocking,* ~~$19,200,000~~ *$69,200,000,* to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the limitations on apropriations contained in Section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260).

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for civil defense activities.

~~No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters.~~

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

EMERGENCY HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for carrying out emergency planning and preparedness functions of the Public Health Service, and procurement, storage (including underground storage), distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense medical supplies and equipment authorized by section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., App. 2281(h)), ~~$8,500,000~~ *$9,250,000,* to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; ~~$10,440,000~~ *$10,775,000.*

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, including not to exceed ~~$3,000,000~~ *$4,300,000* for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, ~~$79,000,000~~ *$86,124,000*, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $90,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; ~~$21,805,000~~

$22,187,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $600,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further,* That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual

transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775), $1,650,000.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3006), $10,650,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $1,138,000 of the funds in the "Employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001–3014), including services as

authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS, RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3053), $14,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, without regard to the provisions of any other Act, not to exceed $348,000 of the funds in the "Retired employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3051–3060), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the estimated cost of new and increased annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided by Part III of Public Law 87–793 (76 Stat. 868), $65,-

000,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed ~~$270,000~~ *$277,000* of the funds in the "Employees life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided*, That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, ~~the continuation of the existing authorized domestic flight service stations,~~ and carrying out the

provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed $10,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; purchase of ~~twelve~~ *sixteen* passenger motor vehicles, including ~~eight~~ *twelve* for replacement only; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; ~~$537,600,000~~ *$544,100,000*: *Provided*, That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed ~~$6,000,000~~ *$6,344,000* or include in excess of ~~396~~ *406* positions: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); and purchase of eight aircraft; ~~$50,000,000~~ *$66,000,000*, to re-

main available until expended: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel: *Provided further, That the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized to reimburse the unincorporated town of Battle Mountain, Nevada, not to exceed $3,500 for the cost of road improvements abutting Government-owned property in Battle Mountain, Nevada.*

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

For grants-in-aid for airports pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, as follows: for the purposes of section 5 (d) (4) of such Act: $66,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; for the purposes of section 5 (d) (5) of such Act, $1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965

and 1966; and for the purposes of section 5 (d) (6) of such Act, $7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301–1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, ~~$21,000,000~~ *$42,000,000*, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; ~~$3,530,000~~ *$3,600,000*.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for police type use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $4,319,000.

CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, ~~$1,620,000~~ *$1,800,000,* to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Dulles International Airport, $180,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Money hereafter recovered from the pool and fountain at Dulles International Airport shall not be subject to the Act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484m, 485a), and may be given to a nonprofit organization which, in the determination of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, promotes and provides for the welfare of travelers in air commerce.

Funds appropriated under this or any other Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Agency may be expended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Agency, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed $85,400), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $14,500), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only ~~$16,310,000~~ *$16,460,000*.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to

exceed $100 per diem for individuals, ~~$12,180,000~~ *$12,699,000*.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, ~~$12,725,000~~ *$13,025,000*: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for an economic questionnaire or financial study of intercorporate relations.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Operating Expenses, Public Buildings Service

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the as-

signment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; ~~$213,800,000~~ *$224,570,000*: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other removable facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its function of protecting the person of the President of the United States and his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President pursuant to title 18, U.S.C. 3056~~: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation may be used to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year~~.

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and

appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; $90,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration shall be considered to be public buildings.

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct and acquire public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of $200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including *fallout shelters therein and* equipment for such buildings, ~~$151,722,000~~ *$161,247,500*; and not to exceed $500,000 of this amount shall be available to the Administrator for construction or alteration of small public

buildings outside the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary, all to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

Federal office building, Centre, Alabama, ~~$144,800~~ *$152,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cullman, Alabama, ~~$417,200~~ *$440,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Vernon, Alabama, ~~$169,900~~ *$179,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hope, Arkansas, ~~$311,700~~ *$329,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Marshall, Arkansas, ~~$178,100~~ *$188,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, McCrory, Arkansas, ~~$91,800~~ *$96,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mountain Home, Arkansas, ~~$179,800~~ *$189,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Blythe, California, ~~$306,300~~ *$323,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Del Mar, California, ~~$146,000~~ *$154,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Harbor City, California, ~~$152,500~~ *$160,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Jackson, California, ~~$255,600~~ *$269,800*;

Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, in addition to the sum heretofore provided, ~~$2,572,200~~ *$2,715,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Solana Beach, California, ~~$146,000~~ *$154,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Weed, California, ~~$126,700~~ *$133,750*;

Federal office building, West Los Angeles, California, ~~$13,101,300~~ *$13,932,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, ~~$312,100~~ *$329,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Leadville, Colorado, ~~$176,400~~ *$186,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor Locks, Connecticut, ~~$240,700~~ *$254,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cross City, Florida, ~~$141,700~~ *$149,550*;

Post office and Federal office building, Oakland Park Branch, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, ~~$152,800~~ *$161,300*;

Federal office building, Jacksonville, Florida, ~~$6,266,300~~ *$6,731,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gratigny Branch, Miami, Florida, ~~$204,400~~ *$215,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Ocoee, Florida, ~~$124,300~~ *$131,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Acworth, Georgia, ~~$127,000~~ *$134,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Chatsworth, Georgia, ~~$208,400~~ *$219,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Toccoa, Georgia, ~~$282,600~~ *$298,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Warm Springs, Georgia, ~~$70,200~~ *$74,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Arthur, Illinois, ~~$110,600~~ *$116,750*;

Federal office building, East St. Louis, Illinois, ~~$773,700~~ *$853,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Edwardsville, Illinois, ~~$342,900~~ *$361,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Red Bud, Illinois, ~~$94,600~~ *$99,850*;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, ~~$1,900,800~~ *$2,087,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, ~~$1,542,600~~ *$1,700,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Scottsburg, Indiana, ~~$232,900~~ *$245,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Shoals, Indiana, ~~$119,700~~ *$126,350*;

Federal office building, Des Moines, Iowa, ~~$7,931,700~~ *$8,491,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Scott City, Kansas, ~~$281,000~~ *$296,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Wellington, Kansas, ~~$259,200~~ *$273,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Clinton, Kentucky, ~~$185,300~~ *$195,600*;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Covington, Kentucky, ~~$3,438,000~~ *$3,629,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cumberland, Kentucky, ~~$102,200~~ *$107,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Olive Hill, Kentucky, ~~$148,400~~ *$156,650*;

Post office and Federal office building, Paris, Kentucky, ~~$218,100~~ *$230,200*;

Federal office building, Richmond, Kentucky, ~~$160,800~~ *$169,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Russell Springs, Kentucky, ~~$86,100~~ *$90,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, ~~$3,393,000~~ *$3,675,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Crowley, Louisiana, ~~$303,500~~ *$320,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gueydan, Louisiana, ~~$101,600~~ *$106,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mamou, Louisiana, ~~$72,000~~ *$76,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mansura, Louisiana, ~~$80,300~~ *$84,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Oberlin, Louisiana, ~~$97,400~~ *$102,800*;

Post office and courthouse, Opelousas, Louisiana, ~~$903,600~~ *$1,004,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Thibodaux, Louisiana, ~~$263,000~~ *$278,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Calais, Maine, ~~$278,200~~ *$293,650*;

Post office and Federal office building, Lubec, Maine, ~~$104,500~~ *$110,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Machias, Maine, ~~$220,600~~ *$232,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Centreville, Maryland, ~~$205,000~~ *$217,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, North East, Maryland, ~~$114,800~~ *$121,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Prince Frederick, Maryland, ~~$185,900~~ *$196,250*;

Central heating plant, Suitland, Maryland, ~~$3,213,000~~ *$3,341,500*;

General Services Administration, Federal records center, Boston, Massachusetts, ~~$883,800~~ *$932,900*;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Boston-Lawrence area, Massachusetts, ~~$3,748,500~~ *$3,956,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Marlboro, Massachusetts, ~~$242,800~~ *$256,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Milford, Massachusetts, ~~$274,600~~ *$289,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, ~~$2,704,500~~ *$2,954,750*;

Internal Revenue Service National Administrative Service Center and Regional Training Center Building, Detroit, Michigan, ~~$2,925,000~~ *$3,087,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Lawton, Michigan, ~~$89,000~~ *$93,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mancelona, Michigan, ~~$94,100~~ *$99,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Baudette, Minnesota, ~~$159,700~~ *$168,550*;

Courthouse and Federal office building, St. Paul, Minnesota, ~~$8,993,300~~ *$9,620,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Bay Springs, Mississippi, ~~$154,800~~ *$163,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Coldwater, Mississippi, ~~$83,500~~ *$88,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Port Gibson, Mississippi, ~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Richton, Mississippi, ~~$80,700~~ *$85,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Branson, Missouri, ~~$142,200~~ *$150,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Crystal City, Missouri, ~~$125,900~~ *$132,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Montgomery City, Missouri, ~~$248,00~~ *$261,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Fullerton, Nebraska, ~~$178,700~~ *$188,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gothenburg, Nebraska, ~~$147,800~~ *$156,000*;

Post office and courthouse, Carson City, Nevada, ~~$1,889,100~~ *$2,061,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Berlin, New Hampshire, ~~$317,000~~ *$334,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Avenel, New Jersey, ~~$133,200~~ *$140,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Burlington, New Jersey, ~~$261,800~~ *$276,350*;

Federal office building, Newark, New Jersey, ~~$12,121,200~~ *$12,903,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Raton, New Mexico, ~~$319,000~~ *$336,900*;

Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, ~~$11,034,900~~ *$11,758,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Keeseville, New York, ~~$106,100~~ *$112,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Andrews, North Carolina, ~~$105,100~~ *$110,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cary, North Carolina, ~~$111,600~~ *$117,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Jacksonville, North Carolina, ~~$274,700~~ *$289,950*;

Federal office building, Kinston, North Carolina, ~~$164,300~~ *$173,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mars Hill, North Carolina, ~~$101,700~~ *$107,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Raeford, North Carolina, ~~$226,900~~ *$239,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Rich Square, North Carolina, ~~$87,300~~ *$92,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Waynesville, North Carolina, ~~$401,000~~ *$423,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor, North Carolina, ~~$151,100~~ *$159,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hillsboro, Ohio, ~~$337,300~~ *$356,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mantua, Ohio, ~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Afton, Oklahoma, ~~$107,300~~ *$113,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Elk City, Oklahoma, ~~$222,400~~ *$234,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hugo, Oklahoma, ~~$269,500~~ *$284,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Jay, Oklahoma, ~~$174,800~~ *$184,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Baker, Oregon, ~~$1,117,800~~ *$1,238,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Enterprise, Oregon, ~~$195,900~~ *$206,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Prineville. Oregon, ~~$252,300~~ *$266,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Scappoose, Oregon, ~~$125,700~~ *$132,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Berwick, Pennsylvania, ~~$267,800~~ *$282,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Brookeville, Pennsylvania, ~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Dallas, Pennsylvania, ~~$151,700~~ *$160,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Duncannon, Pennsylvania, ~~$92,300~~ *$97,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Falls Creek, Pennsylvania, ~~$96,700~~ *$102,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Galeton, Pennsylvania, ~~$119,500~~ *$126,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hawley, Pennsylvania, ~~$151,700~~ *$160,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Irwin, Pennsylvania, ~~$224,400~~ *$236,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Montrose, Pennsylvania, ~~$151,700~~ *$160,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, New Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, ~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cedarhurst Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, ~~$182,300~~ *$192,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Green Tree Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, ~~$182,300~~ *$192,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Pleasant Hills Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, ~~$182,300~~ *$192,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Youngsville, Pennsylvania, ~~$96,700~~ *$107,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Humacao, Puerto Rico, ~~$181,300~~ *$191,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Olneyville Station, Providence, Rhode Island, ~~$235,300~~ *$248,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Elloree, South Carolina, ~~$87,400~~ *$92,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Ridgeland, South Carolina, ~~$246,500~~ *$260,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Williston, South Carolina, ~~$91,800~~ *$96,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Oneida, Tennessee, ~~$131,800~~ *$139,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Buffalo, Texas, ~~$86,000~~ *$90,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Carthage, Texas, ~~$235,600~~ *$248,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Fairfield, Texas, ~~$168,700~~ *$178,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gonzales, Texas, ~~$224,000~~ *$236,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Naples, Texas, ~~$104,100~~ *$109,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Sulphur Springs, Texas, ~~$279,500~~ *$295,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Heber, Utah, ~~$161,300~~ *$170,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Provo, Utah. ~~$378,000~~ *$399,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, St. Johnsbury, Vermont, ~~$335,000~~ *$353,600*;

Franconia warehouse building, Franconia, Virginia, $5,800,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Cle Elum, Washington, ~~$120,200~~ *$126,900*;

Federal office building, Colville, Washington, ~~$393,200~~ *$415,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Newport, Washington, ~~$136,700~~ *$144,300*;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Spokane, Washington, ~~$6,385,500~~ *$6,857,250*;

Federal office building, Vancouver, Washington, ~~$426,500~~ *$450,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gassaway, West Virginia, ~~$115,200~~ *$121,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenville, West Virginia, ~~$159,300~~ *$168,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Parsons, West Virginia, ~~$171,200~~ *$180,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Pineville, West Virginia, ~~$157,500~~ *$166,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Summersville, West Virginia, ~~$232,200~~ *$245,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, ~~$129,300~~ *$136,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Eagle River, Wisconsin, ~~$152,700~~ *$161,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Elroy, Wisconsin, ~~$113,400~~ *$119,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Horicon, Wisconsin, ~~$120,800~~ *$127,500*;

Housing and Home Finance Agency building, District of Columbia, ~~$26,027,100~~ *$27,554,050*:

Provided further, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum: *Provided further*, That the amount of $840,300 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1961 and 1962, for projects at Vanceboro, Maine, Pembina, North Dakota, and Wyandotte, Michigan, is hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation, and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the Post Office and Federal office building at Augusta, Maine, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, is hereby increased by $460,000 *and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the border station facility at Derby Line, Vermont, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962, is hereby increased by $183,000.*

Not to exceed $120,000 heretofore appropriated under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects", in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, may be transferred to the appropriation for "Construction, United

States Mission Building, New York, New York", for the payment of contractor's claims.

Sites and Expenses, Public Buildings Projects

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, $33,200,000, to remain available until expended.

Payments, Public Buildings Purchase Contracts

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), $9,885,000.

Expenses, United States Court Facilities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to provide, directly or indirectly, additional space for the United States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and furnishings; $1,030,600.

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system (including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and other supply management and related activities, as authorized by law, ~~$48,920,000,~~ *$52,420,000*.

OPERATING EXPENSES, UTILIZATION AND DISPOSAL SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property, and rehabilitation of personal property, as authorized by law, $9,512,500, to be derived from proceeds from the transfer of excess property and the disposal of surplus property.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, ~~$14,955,000~~ *$15,155,000*, including $25,000 which

shall be available for continuing to carry out the purposes of section 2 of Public Law 88–195 approved December 11, 1963, for the period ending June 30, 1965.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation, communications, and other public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, ~~$5,465,000~~ *$5,765,000*.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h), during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), not to exceed $1,500,000 for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is

responsible, including reimbursement for security guard services, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed ~~$2,875,000~~ *$3,000,000* for operating expenses, $17,755,000, to be derived from sales of strategic and critical materials: *Provided,* That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Act provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further,* That any receipts from sales during the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury except as otherwise provided herein: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the

Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and, after compliance with the disposal requirements of section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, excess materials in the national stockpile established pursuant to that Act, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, ~~$1,505,000~~ *$1,530,000*: *Provided,* That not to exceed $500 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (78 Stat. 153), $400,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $310,000: *Provided,* That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to

carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund: *Provided,* That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further,* That the total amount deposited into said account for the current fiscal year from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed ~~$19,565,000~~ *$21,840,000*: *Provided further,* That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

To increase the capital of the working capital fund established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), $100,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,

and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Appropriations to the General Services Administration under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" made in this Act shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under that appropriation: *Provided,* That nothing herein

shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided,* That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of build-

ings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose space for any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies at an estimated cost of construction in excess of $200,000 or for the payment of the salary of any person who executes such a lease agreement: *Provided,* That the foregoing proviso shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for the lease construction of space has been submitted to and approved by the appropriate Committees of the Congress in the same manner as for public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles *including one at not to exceed $4,000 and one* for replacement only; ~~$15,525,000~~ *$15,925,000*: *Provided,* That during the current fiscal year non-administrative expenses, as defined by law (77 Stat. 437), shall not exceed ~~$3,250,000~~ *$3,500,000.*

Urban Planning Grants

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $2,350,000.

Urban Studies and Housing Research

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, $387,400.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, MASS TRANSPORTATION DEMONSTRATIONS

For necessary expenses in connection with mass transportation demonstration projects, as authorized by section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $100,000.

OPEN SPACE LAND GRANTS

For expenses in connection with grants to aid in the acquisition of open-space land or interests therein, and with the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), $15,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $262,000 may be used for administrative expenses and technical assistance, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with grants requiring payments in excess of the amount herein appropriated therefor.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATIONS

For necessary expenses in connection with low income housing demonstration projects, as authorized by section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, $50,000.

PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), $1,000,000, together with such additional sums not to exceed $3,000,000 as may be necessary to restore to said

revolving fund the amounts which are not required to be repaid pursuant to section 702 (g) of the Housing Act of 1954, as added by section 6 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (40 U.S.C. 462g), to be immediately available.

URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $200,000,000.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), $25,000,000.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), $200,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, ~~$15,484,000~~ *$16,084,000*, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; and purchase of not to exceed ~~thirty-six~~ *thirty-eight* passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; ~~$25,260,000~~ *$25,710,000*, of which not less than $1,889,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $1,261,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Research and Development

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than

administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration $4,413,594,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For advance planning, design, and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $262,880,500, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; purchase or hire of not to exceed two aircraft for administrative use; maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase and hire of motor vehicles (including purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which forty shall be for replacement only); and maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; $623,525,500.

General Provisions

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without the consent of the Congress.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Operation and Maintenance of Properties

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, $37,000: *Provided,* That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further,* That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing

Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); *purchase of one aircraft; maintenance and operation of aircraft;* hire of passenger motor vehicles *and aircraft*; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $420,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any

other agency of the government for research without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $2,600,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $14,680,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); *hire of motor vehicles;* purchase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $38,-

000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; ~~$39,440,000~~ *$40,578,000*: *Provided,* That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for and recognition of war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; reimbursement of the Department of the Army for the services of the officer assigned to the Veterans Administration to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; ~~$155,000,000~~ *$155,250,000*: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for

each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, as authorized by law ~~$14,200,000~~ *$14,500,000*.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, ~~$36,000,000~~ *$38,000,000*, of which ~~$1,170,000~~ *$1,275,000* shall be for prosthetic research and development activities.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational articles and facilities; maintenance, operation and acquisition of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not

otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of eighty-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code; $1,115,935,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided,* That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, burial flags, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19,

1924, as amended, and for payment of amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C. 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions of 38 U.S.C. 351, $3,963,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as saved from repeal by section 12 (a) of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1264), and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, ~~$34,600,000~~ *$39,600,000*, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, $13,700,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States

Code, ~~$91,233,000~~ *$98,733,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Texas, is reduced from "$2,000,000" to "$1,990,000".

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, $310,000.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses~~, but not to exceed $257,000,000,~~ for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses: *Provided further, That, in addition, not to exceed $200,000,000 of unobligated balances of said Direct*

loans revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amount as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

The appropriation available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-

erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board, to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the

Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation of Administrative and Nonadministrative Expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Not to exceed a total of ~~$3,670,000~~ *$3,825,000* shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which may procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and contracts for such services with one organization may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances therefor in accordance with the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131–2133), and said amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided,* That all necessary expenses in connection with the conserva-

torship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 6 (i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding

any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449) : *Provided further,* That the nonadministrative expenses (except those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed $13,120,000 for not to exceed 1,000 positions.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $225,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be

properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730a).

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, College Housing Loans

Not to exceed $1,900,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed $1,220,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $110,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the

Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Not to exceed $915,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed $8,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized

expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed ~~$9,000,000~~ *$10,375,000* of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by

the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed $1,500): *Provided further,* That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed ~~$75,000,000~~ *$78,750,000.*

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433), including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from

such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed $1,420,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and

classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1965".

Passed the House of Representatives May 21, 1964.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 1206

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

[Report No. 1269]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

MAY 22 (legislative day, MARCH 30), 1964
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 30, 1964
Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D.C. 20250
Official business Postage and fees paid
U. S. Department of Agriculture

Issued Aug. 6, 1964
For actions of Aug. 5, 1964
88th-2nd; No. 151

CONTENTS

Administrative law.....44
Appalachia.....41
Appropriations.....1,3
ASC committeemen.....18
Automation.....13,34,43
Budget.....5
Civil rights.....35
Containers.....15
Crop insurance.....18
Dairy.....20
Electrification.....7,16
Employment.....24
Farm labor.....23
Federal aid.....31
Federal-State relations..9
Fisheries.....38
Flood control.....45
Foreign aid.....8
Forest products.....22
Forestry.....33
Housing.....14
Lands.....18,39
Life insurance.....4
Manpower.....34
Meat imports.....12,29,37
National parks.....46
Natural resources.....33
Pay.....21
Personnel.....4,21,28,32
Poverty.....11,26
Property.....31
Public debt.....6
Public works.....3
Reclamation.....19
Recreation.....2,30
Research.....40
Roads.....36
Seed screenings.....18
Soil resources.....25
Tariff.....17,27
Taxation.....6
Water.....10
Watersheds.....20

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee reported resolution to send meat-import restriction bill to conference and Rep. Roosevelt commended this action. House began debate on poverty bill. House committee reported housing bill. Senate committee voted to report land and water conservation fund bill. Senate committee reported public works appropriation bill. Senate passed independent offices appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Passed as reported this bill, H. R. 11296. Conferees were appointed. pp. 17509-15, 17528-35, 17544-7, 17554-77

2. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 3846, to establish a Land and Water Conservation Fund to assist in the improvement of outdoor recreation facilities. p. D642

Passed as reported S. 2048, to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation area. pp. 17577-8

Sen. Metcalf inserted a speech urging that "all of us must shift our outdoor recreation emphasis from the national panorama to specific projects which will improve our local communities." pp. 17490-1

3. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 11579 (S. Rept. 1326). p. 17482

4. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 1974, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act with regard to designation of beneficiary. p. D643

5. BUDGET. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized the rising number of Federal employees and called "the Kennedy-Johnson administration...the most extravagant regime that has ever occupied the White House." p. 17485

6. NATIONAL DEBT; TAXATION. Passed as reported S. 2281, to clarify the components of, and to assist in the management of, the national debt and the tax structure. pp. 17585-8

7. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Metcalf called for greater Federal participation in the interregional transmission system and inserted an article by Sen. Neuberger in a similar vein, "Surrender in the West." pp. 17489-90

Sen. Morse inserted a corrected version of his speech delivered Aug. 4, 1964, on electric power in the Pacific Northwest. pp. 17537-44

8. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Long, Mo., called the foreign aid program "an effective weapon in today's struggle between freedom and communism" and outlined the contribution of various Mo. universities to the AID program. pp. 17506-7

9. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Sen. Hill inserted a speech by Sen. Muskie, "Intergovernmental Relations" calling for the three levels of government to work together. pp. 17589-91

10. WATER. Sen. Morse spoke against Westlands water distribution system contract and inserted statements which "establish beyond a doubt its illegality under existing reclamation laws." pp. 17493-503

HOUSE

11. POVERTY. Began debate on H. R. 11377, the poverty bill. pp. 17610-52

12. MEAT IMPORTS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to send to conference H. R. 1839, the meat-import restriction bill (p. 17668), and Rep. Roosevelt commended this action (pp. 17595-6).

Rep. Nelsen inserted his testimony before the Rules Committee in favor of a resolution for House concurrence in the beef-import amendments adopted by the Senate to H. R. 1839. pp. 17656-7

13. AUTOMATION. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 11611, to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. This bill bill will now be sent to the President. p. 17610

14. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12175, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities (H. Rept. 1703). p. 17668

which is vital for future relations between have and have-not countries.

The successes of technical assistance have been numerous. They are often the one-man or one-team projects whose greatest contribution has been to teach the use of farm machines or to improve productivity in an impoverished area.

Universities in the United States and in less-developed countries have combined their facilities and personnel to plan ways of communicating new agricultural methods and new village health programs. With food production up and health standards up, local communities can rise above subsistence levels. Some men will be able to move to the cities. Others will stay, will be healthier and better fed, and will continue to raise their own productivity levels. By increasing the flow of manpower and food to urban centers, we are fulfilling one of the basic tasks of economic development.

Mr. President, since 1957, Missouri has been participating in a technical assistance project designed to increase the agricultural productivity of northeast India. In 1961, Quinton Kinder, poultry specialist from the University of Missouri, created a modern demonstration poultry unit. With 450 Missouri White Leghorns and some Rhode Island Reds, he produced a flock of 175 layers in 1962. Last year, these hens produced more than 15,000 hatching eggs.

Meanwhile, the University of Missouri was training Professor Bora, from India, to return to Assam Agricultural College, India, to carry on Professor Kinder's work. Not long ago, Professor Bora wrote:

> The unique services of Professor Kinder to our poultry unit, and the US–AID cooperation and dedication of the fine buildings to us, will be written in the letters of gold in our heart of hearts.

Floyd E. Rogers, another professor from the University of Missouri, helped the farmers of Ankhola village triple their crops by improved irrigation. The villagers expressed their gratitude by writing:

> We like to assure you that we shall make the best use of your so generous and sincere help and would always feel proud to speak about you and your countrymen. Our * * * children will also remember in the future this kind of help from Americans.

Other Missouri universities have AID missions abroad. St. Louis University, through AID, is assisting the Catholic University of Ecuador to improve its training operations in education, foreign languages, basic sciences, nursing and social sciences.

Washington University, in St. Louis, is helping South Korea improve its business management education curriculum.

At the same time, many AID technical assistance projects in less-developed countries are calling on Missouri firms for everything from fertilizer to refrigeration equipment.

Mr. President, I am proud of the role Missouri is playing in our technical assistance program. We have seen over the years the quietly dramatic change the efforts of men and ideas can make. We have felt the warm responses of thankful people in less-developed countries.

Eventually our part in the total aid program will have brought India and several other countries far along the road toward self-sustained growth.

It is not enough to see how great the need is for our technical assistance. We must continue to come face to face with the daily problems of meeting that need if we are to say we are bearing our responsibility to the world.

Their growth and development is no less than a keystone to a world of peace and prosperity. At present the turbulence of independence, poverty, and backwardness has left many of these countries to be unstable members of the international community. The possibility of crises—such as in the Congo and Malaysia—continue. Until we have completed our role in the growth of less-developed areas, we can expect new crises. Some countries, of course, are directly threatened by Communist subversion or aggression. To these countries our national interest impels us to continue supporting and military assistance.

But foreign aid is not just an anti-Communist program. To countries where the threat is the constantly widening economic gap between them and us, we must do all we can to avert the dangers this gap is bringing.

We are a Nation whose great goal is to use our vast democratic, economic, political, and military power for the purposes of world peace. Any substantial cut in the foreign aid bill would be a step away from our goal. Every human contribution is a reaffirmation of our humble ability to respond to the most desperate needs of the world. In this response, we are preparing countries to stand on their own—strong and ready to continue the international construction of world peace.

To me, the foreign aid question is very simple. We are in a cold war with communism. The question is: Do we fight this war with dollars or do we fight it with our boys?

The principle of foreign aid is right. We have heard reports of some mismanagement in this cold war program. But we also know there have been examples of mismanagement in hot wars. I would like to point out that mismanagement in a cold war usually means loss of just dollars. In a hot war, it means loss of lives. Certainly, we must strive to tighten up our cold war aid program as much as possible.

While it may be necessary in certain instances, such as Vietnam, to commit limited military forces, I believe our foreign aid program remains an effective weapon in today's struggle between freedom and communism.

Mr. President, I wish to make it absolutely clear that as long as I am in the U.S. Senate I will vote to send our dollars to fight a cold war before I will vote to send our boys to fight a hot war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLIGHT SERVICE STATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is my understanding the Senate will soon be considering the independent offices appropriation bill, the number of which bill is H.R. 11296.

Last January, the Federal Aviation Agency, which is one of the independent agencies within the purview of this particular appropriation bill, announced its intention to consolidate 42 of the 296 manned flight service stations located in the contiguous 48 States.

Some of these consolidated stations were to be placed on a remote rather than a manned operating basis, the stations to be operated by remote control rather than by personnel at the stations.

This move by the Federal Aviation Agency was protested vigorously by most segments of aviation as a serious blow to flight safety and as being unjustified by the alleged economies to be effected thereby.

Flight service stations have been reduced in numbers continually since World War II. Immediately following the war, 464 stations were in operation. Now there are 296. The Federal Aviation Agency has proposed to reduce these stations by 42 as a first step in consolidating additional units of these facilities.

The flight service stations which are affected by this order are vital to the safety of all aviation, but to general aviation in particular. The private pilot and the business pilot use these facilities regularly, and they depend upon them for navigation and safety. The continuous reduction of these services is a serious blow to a constantly expanding segment of aviation; namely, general aviation.

The financial justification offered in connection with this move is indeed questionable. The Federal Aviation Agency contends that its action would result in savings of $1,470,000. In my State of Kansas, the proposal would affect four stations, at Russell, Dodge City, Goodland, and Manhattan. The annual saving is said to be $153,000. However, the personnel costs included in this figure are not, in fact, savings, because the personnel would be offered other positions without loss of grade or income. At the same time the Federal Aviation Agency will be required to spend at least $120,000 to remote the consolidated stations and maintain these remote facilities at an unannounced cost.

In effect, the Federal Aviation Agency has proposed a reduction of flight services and safety at a dollar saving which is, at least, questionable.

When this matter was considered by the House, the House inserted language

in the appropriation bill specifically providing for "the continuation of the existing authorized flight stations." As we consider the bill, which contains funds for the Federal Aviation Agency, we find that that language has been deleted.

I appreciate the inflexible position in which the Federal Aviation Agency would find itself if the House language were to remain in the bill. The Agency should have some discretion in alining its facilities to meet the needs of the times. On the other hand, the proposals of last January were ill-conceived and not supported in fact. In this, the House obviously concurred.

I believe the RECORD should show that the deletion of the House language by the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate's approval of this appropriation bill without the House language does not, in effect, endorse the action announced by the Federal Aviation Agency last January to close down several of the manned stations.

I hope that with the passage of the bill, the Federal Aviation Agency, which by and large does an excellent job, will reevaluate the proposal to close and consolidate flight service stations with great care and consideration of the general services they render to aviation.

I would not like to have that Agency, which is charged with providing services to protect the safety of all aviation, act counter to that responsibility simply to justify the administration's desire for an image of frugality.

I believe that the Federal Aviation Agency needs great flexibility in determining what stations should remain operative, and will consider the protests, as represented by the very able and persuasive case made by many who contribute so much to aviation in the State of Kansas.

Perhaps in future cases the facts which they brought out last year will be assigned the attention of the Federal Aviation Agency they deserve.

To repeat, I hope the language which has been deleted from the House version of the bill will not be interpreted as any ratification by Congress of the action of FAA in proposing to close the flight stations last year, but, rather, will be taken as representing recognition of the need for flexibility in the administration of their function.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is the foreign aid bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1206, H.R. 11296, the independent offices appropriation bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Withonut objection, it is so ordered.

FACILITATION OF PERFORMANCE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid temporarily aside and that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1233, H.R. 8611.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8611) to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 1, after line 8, to strike out:

"(b) With the approval of the Administrator, any contract for research authorized by this section or for medical research or development authorized by section 4101 of this title, may provide for the indemnification of contractors to the extent and subject to the limitations provided in section 2354, title 10, United States Code, except that approval and certification required thereby shall be by the Administrator."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(b)(1) With the approval of the Administrator, any contract for research authorized by this section or for medical research or development authorized by section 4101 of this title, the performance of which involves a risk of an unusually hazardous nature, may provide that the United States will indemnify the contractor against either or both of the following, but only to the extent that they arise out of the direct performance of the contract and to the extent not covered by the financial protection required under subsection (b)(5)—

"(A) liability (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement) to third persons, except liability under State or Federal Workmen's Compensation Acts to employees of the contractor employed at the site of and in connection with the contract for which indemnification is granted, for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous.

"(B) loss of or damage to property of the contractor from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous.

"(2) A contract that provides for indemnification in accordance with subsection (b)(1) must also provide for—

"(A) notice to the United States of any claim or suit against the contractor for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property; and

"(B) control of or assistance in the defense by the United States, at its election, of any such suit or claim for which indemnification is provided hereunder.

"(3) No payment may be made under subsection (b)(1) unless the Administrator, or his designee, certifies that the amount is just and reasonable.

"(4) Upon approval by the Administrator, payments under subsection (b)(1) may be made from—

"(A) funds obligated for the performance of the contract concerned;

"(B) funds available for research or development, or both, and not otherwise obligated; or

"(C) funds appropriated for those payments.

"(5) Each contractor which is a party to an indemnification agreement under subsection (b)(1) shall have and maintain financial protection of such type and in such amounts as the Administrator shall require to cover liability to third persons and loss of or damage to the contractor's property. The amount of financial protection required shall be the maximum amount of insurance available from private sources, except that the Administrator may establish a lesser amount, taking into consideration the cost and terms of private insurance. Such financial protection may include private insurance, private contractual indemnities, self-insurance, other proof of financial responsibility, or a combination of such measures.

"(6) In administering the provisions of this section, the Administrator may use the facilities and services of private insurance organizations, and he may contract to pay a reasonable compensation therefor. Any contract made under the provisions of this subsection may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), upon a showing by the Administrator that advertising is not reasonably practicable, and advance payments may be made.

"(7) The authority to indemnify contractors under this section does not create any rights in third persons which would not otherwise exist by law.

"(8) As used in this section, the term 'contractor' includes subcontractors of any tier under a contract in which an indemnification provision pursuant to subsection (b)(1) is contained."

And, on page 5, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The amendments made by section 6 of the Act of July 7, 1964 (Public Law 88-361, 78 Stat. 297), shall take effect as of January 1, 1964.

INDEMNIFICATION OF RESEARCH CONTRACTORS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, currently some difficulty is arising from a refusal or reluctance of contractors or suppliers to undertake or to become involved in a research or development contract, without securing some guarantee or indemnification in the event of liability resulting from these projects. As a

result, some developmental work is stymied before the work is completed.

The VA requested that the original bill be introduced. However, after the bill had been passed by the House, objection was voiced by the various insurance companies who feared that under the original bill a precedent might be set for governmental competition with private insurance. The VA did not view the bill as such. After conferences with representatives of the insurance industry, the VA submitted a suggested amendment, in the form of a complete redraft of the proposed legislation. The committee recommended passage of this bill, as amended.

The bill, as amended, authorizes the United States to indemnify a contractor against certain risks of an unusually hazardous nature. It also provides that a party to an indemnification agreement shall maintain financial protection at least equal to the amount of private insurance available. However, there is included discretionary authority whereby the Administrator may authorize a lesser amount, whenever costs or terms of private insurance would make its purchase prohibitive.

In addition to these provisions, the amendment sets forth the specifics, such as extent of coverage, limitations, and so forth, in title 38, United States Code, rather than referring to the Department of Defense provisions in title 10, for such information.

The drafting of this amendment has followed, to a great extent, a provision contained in an 87th Congress bill—section 308 of H.R. 8095—involving the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which was favorably reported to the House by the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Similar provision is also made in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission (42 U.S.C. 2210(g)).

This bill, as amended, is supported by the VA, the Bureau of the Budget, the various insurance groups, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The second amendment would apply to H.R. 221, which we passed on June 23, 1964, and which has been signed into law by the President—Public Law 88–361. When that bill—H.R. 221—was considered by the House, that body adopted an amendment that purported to be in the identical language of S. 2636, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. But the House inadvertently omitted the final clause of the bill. This amendment is favored by the VA; and the House has indicated that it will readily agree to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1297) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

In recent years the Veterans' Administration has encountered difficulty in obtaining necessary materials and supplies due to a reluctance on the part of contractors and suppliers to become involved in research for the development of new projects without securing some guarantee of indemnification which would protect them in the event of liability resulting from claims made as a result of damages from experiments performed pursuant to a contract with the Veterans' Administration.

Presently, no authority exists for inclusion of protection of this type to be placed in contracts negotiated by the Veterans' Administration. The cost of insurance, if such should be available, would be extremely high, if not prohibitive. Recently the problem has become acute, apparently stemming from several recent court decisions extending the legal doctrine of implied warranty of a manufactured product. The Department of Defense, as well as the National Institutes of Health have authority which provides protection for contractors dealing with those two agencies of the Federal Government. The subject bill would provide identical protection for the Veterans' Administration and would permit the inclusion in future contracts of an indemnification clause to protect contractors who were found liable for a product manufactured or developed by them and from which injury resulted.

This bill, as amended, would authorize the United States to indemnify a contractor engaged in a medical research or development project for the Veterans' Administration against certain risks of an unusually hazardous nature. It also provides, that a party to an indemnification agreement shall maintain financial protection at least equal to the amount of private insurance available. However, discretionary authority is included whereby the Administrator may authorize a lesser amount whenever costs or terms of private insurance would make its purchase prohibitive.

In addition to the provisions discussed above, the amendment would set forth the specifics, such as extent of coverage, limitations, etc., in title 38, United States Code, rather than referring to the Department of Defense provisions in title 10, United States Code, for such information.

The drafting of this amendment has followed, to a great extent, a provision contained in an 87th Congress bill (sec. 308 of H.R. 8095) involving the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which was favorably reported to the House by the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Similar provision is also made in the case of Atomic Energy Commission (42 U.S.C. 2210(g)).

The second amendment would apply to H.R. 221, which the Senate passed on June 23, 1964, and which has been signed into law by the President (Public Law 88–361). When that bill (H.R. 221) was passed by the House, an amendment was adopted that purported to be in the identical language of S. 2636, by Senator HILL. But the House inadvertently omitted the final clause of the bill.

The Veterans' Administration believes that the cost to the Government would be minimal, and that the amendment would result in no additional cost to the Government.

This legislation was formally requested by the Veterans' Administration.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1965 as reported to the Senate totals $13,585,956,500, which is $635,554,900 under the 1965 estimates, including two items requested for 1964, and is $343,355,950 over the appropriations for 1964.

However, that item, which I will explain later, and which will be brought out in the course of debate, involves the Space Agency, with respect to which the Senate had to take the budget estimates in order to negotiate that item with the House. The authorization for space had not been completed at the time the House took up the appropriation bill.

The increase over the House figure is $5,494,258,500. Again, this unusually large increase results from the need to restore $5,300 million in funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which were stricken out by a point of order on the House floor due to lack of authorization at that time. Since that time, the Senate and the House have passed the authorization bill, and it has been enacted into law.

Aside from NASA, on all the items in the bill, the increase over the House is $194,258,500, which includes $8,013,000 over the budget estimates for the following items:

For payments to air carriers under the Civil Aeronautics Board $2 million to pay unfunded subsidy obligations to local service airlines, and $1,300,000 to conform to the Board order fixing helicopter subsidy rates.

For sites and expenses under General Services Administration, $3,700,000 for two additional projects anticipated to be shortly authorized.

For medical research under the Veterans' Administration, an addition of $1,013,000 to keep this important program adequately funded.

The larger restorations recommended by the committee are: $65 million for civil defense, $57,620,500 for General Services Administration, and $43,750,000 for Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. President, since the bill is lengthy and complex and involves many important agencies of the Government, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text, and that no points of order be considered waived.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "Office", to strike out "$4,285,000" and insert "$4,855,000"; in line 23 after the word "exceed", to strike out "$250,000" and insert $600,000", and on page 3, line 1, after the word "for" to insert "emergency preparedness and".

On page 4, line 1, after "per diem", to strike out "$880,000" and insert "$950,000".

On page 4, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$85,000,000"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000"; and in line 21, after the word "amended", to strike out the comma and "and not to exceed $13,500,000 shall be available for management expenses for civil de-

fense including not to exceed 1,000 positions".

On page 5, line 6, after the words "surveys", to strike out "and marking" and insert "marking and stocking", and in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$19,200,000" and insert "$69,200,000".

On page 5, after line 18, to strike out:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters."

On page 6, line 11, after "(50 U.S.C., App. 2281(h),", to strike out "$8,500,000" and insert "$9,250,000".

On page 6, line 23, after the words "per diem", to strike out "$10,440,000" and insert "$10,775,000".

On page 7, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,300,000", and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$79,000,000" and insert "$86,124,000".

On page 7, line 23, after the word "amended", to strike out "$21,805,000" and insert "$22,187,000".

On page 11, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$270,000" and insert "$277,000".

On page 11, line 21, after the word "facilities", to strike out "the continuation of the existing authorized domestic flight service stations,"; on page 12, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "twelve" and insert "sixteen"; in line 4, after the word "including", to strike out "eight" and insert "twelve"; in line 5, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$537,600,000" and insert "$544,100,000"; in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,344,000", and in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "396" and insert "406".

On page 12, line 25, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$66,000,000", and on page 13, line 7, after the word "tunnel", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized to reimburse the unincorporated town of Battle Mountain, Nevada, not to exceed $3,500 for the cost of road improvements abutting Government-owned property in Battle Mountain, Nevada."

On page 14, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$21,000,000" and insert "$42,000,000".

On page 14, line 16, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$3,530,000" and insert "$3,600,000".

On page 15, line 3, after the word "land", to strike out "$1,620,000" and insert "$1,800,000".

At the top of page 16, to insert:

"Funds appropriated under this or any other Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Agency may be expended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Agency, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development."

On page 16, line 19, after the word "only", to strike out "$16,310,000" and insert "$16,460,000".

On page 17, line 1, after the word "individuals", to strike out "$12,180,000" and insert "$12,699,000".

On page 17, line 9, after the words "per diem", to strike out "$12,725,000" and insert "$13,025,000".

On page 18, line 4, after the word "moving", to strike out "$213,800,000" and insert "$224,570,000", and in line 12, after "U.S.C. 3056", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year".

On page 19, line 22, after the word "including", to insert "fallout shelters therein and", and in line 23, after the word "buildings", to strike out "151,722,000" and insert "$161,247,500".

On page 20, line 7, after "Alabama", to strike out "144,800" and insert "152,850".

On page 20, line 10, after "Alabama", to strike out "$417,200" and insert "$440,350".

On page 20, line 12, to strike out "$169,900" and insert "$179,300".

On page 20, line 14, to strike out "$311,700" and insert "$329,000".

On page 20, line 16, after "Arkansas", to strike out "$178,100" and insert "$188,000",

On page 20, line 18, after "Arkansas", to strike out "$91,800" and insert "$96,900".

On page 20, line 20, after "Arkansas", to strike out "$179,800" and insert "$189,800".

On page 20, line 22, after "California", to strike out "$306,300" and insert "$323,300".

On page 20, line 24, after "California", to strike out "$146,000" and insert "$154,100".

On page 21, line 2, after "California", to strike out "$152,500" and insert "$160,950".

On page 21, line 4, after "California", to strike out "$255,600" and insert "$269,800".

On page 21, line 7, after the word "provided", to strike out "$2,572,200" and insert "$2,715,100".

On page 21, line 9, after "California", to strike out "$146,000" and insert "$154,100".

On page 21, line 11, to strike out "$126,700" and insert "$133,750".

On page 21, line 13, to strike out "$13,101,300" and insert "$13,932,150".

On page 21, line 15, after "Colorado", to strike out "$312,100" and insert "$329,450".

On page 21, line 17, after "Colorado", to strike out "$176,400" and insert "$186,200".

On page 21, line 19, after "Connecticut", to strike out "$240,700" and insert "$254,050".

On page 21, line 21, after "Florida", to strike out "$141,700" and insert "$149,550".

On page 21, line 21, after "Florida", to strike out "$152,800" and insert "$161,300".

On page 22, line 2, to strike out "$6,266,300" and insert "$6,731,400".

On page 22, line 4, after "Florida", to strike out "$204,400" and insert "$215,750".

On page 22, line 6, to strike out "$124,300" and insert "$131,200".

On page 22, line 8, to strike out "$127,000" and insert "$134,050".

On page 22, line 10, after "Georgia", to strike out "$208,400" and insert "$219,950".

On page 22, line 12, to strike out $282,600" and insert "$298,300".

On page 22, line 14, after "Georgia", to strike out "$70,200" and insert "$74,100".

On page 22, line 16, to strike out "$110,600" and insert "$116,750".

On page 22, line 17, after "Illinois", to strike out "$773,700" and insert "$853,700".

On page 22, line 20, after "Illinois", to strike out "$342,900" and insert "$361,950".

On page 22, line 22, to strike out "$94.600" and insert "$99,850".

On page 22, line 24, after "Indiana", to strike out "$1,900,800" and insert "$2,087,400".

On page 23, line 2, after "Indiana", to strike out "$1,542,600" and insert "$1,700,300".

On page 23. line 4, after "Indiana", to strike out "$232,900" and insert "$245,850".

On page 23, line 6, to strike out "$119,700" and insert "$126,350.

On page 23, line 7, after "Iowa, to strike out "$7,931,700 and insert "$8,491,350".

On page 23, line 10, after "Kansas", to strike out "$281,000" and insert "$296,600".

On page 23, line 12, after "Kansas", to strike out "$259,200" and insert "$273,600".

On page 23, line 14, after "Kentucky", to strike out "$185,300" and insert "$195,600".

On page 23, line 16, after "Kentucky", to strike out "$3,438,000" and insert "3,629,000".

On page 23, line 18, after "Kentucky", to strike out "$102,200" and insert "$107,900".

On page 23, line 20, after "Kentucky", to strike out "$148,400" and insert "$156,650".

On page 23, line 22, to strike out "$218,100" and insert "$230,200".

On page 23, line 23, after "Kentucky", to strike out "$160,800" and insert "$169,750".

On page 24, line 2, after "Kentucky", to strike out "$86,100" and insert "$90,900".

On page 24, line 4, after "Louisiana", to strike out "$3,393,000" and insert "$3,675,500".

On page 24, line 6, after "Louisiana", to strike out $303,500" and insert "320,350".

On page 24, line 8, after "Louisiana", to strike out "$101,600" and insert"$106,200".

On page 24, line 10, after "Louisiana", to strike out "$72,000" and insert "$76,000".

On page 24, line 12, after "Louisiana", to strike out "$80,300" and insert "$84,750".

On page 24, line 14, after "Louisiana", to strike out "$97,400" and insert "$102,800".

On page 24, line 16, to strike out "$903,600" and insert "$1,004,800".

On page 24, line 18, after Louisiana", to strike out "$263,000" and insert "$278,150".

On page 24, line 20, to strike out "$278,200" and insert "$293,650".

On page 24, line 22, to strike out "$104,500" and insert "$110,300".

On page 24, line 24, to strike out "$220,600" and insert "$232,850".

On page 25, line 2, after "Maryland", to strike out "$205,000" and insert "$217,000".

On page 25, line 4, after "Maryland", to strike out "$114,800" and insert "$121,200".

On page 25, line 6, after "Maryland", to strike out "$185,900" and insert "$196,250".

On page 25, line 7, after "Maryland", to strike out "$3,213,000" and insert "$3,341,500".

On page 25, line 10, after "Massachusetts", to strike out "$883,800" and insert "$932,900".

On page 25, line 12, after "Massachusetts", to strike out "$3,748,500" and insert "$3,956,750".

On page 25, line 15, after "Massachusetts", to strike out "$242,800" and insert "$256,300".

On page 25, line 17, after "Massachusetts", to strike out "$274,600" and insert "$289,850".

On page 25, line 19, after "Massachusetts", to strike out "$2,704,500" and insert "$2,954,750".

On page 25, line 22, after "Michigan", to strike out "$2,925,000" and insert "$3,087,500".

On page 26, line 2, after "Michigan", to strike out "$89,000" and insert "$93,950".

On page 26, line 4, after "Michigan", to strike out "$94,100" and insert "$99,300".

On page 26, line 6, after "Minnesota", to strike out "$159,700" and insert "$168,550".

On page 26, line 8, after "Minnesota", to strike out "$8,993,300" and insert "$9,620,150".

On page 26, line 10, after "Mississippi", to strike out "$154,800" and insert "$163,400".

On page 26, line 12, after "Mississippi", to strike out "$83,500" and insert "$88,150".

On page 26, line 14, after "Mississippi", to strike out "$154,400" and insert "$163,000".

On page 26, line 16, after "Mississippi", to strike out "$80,700" and insert "$85,200".

On page 26, line 18, after "Missouri", to strike out "$142,200" and insert "$150,100".

On page 26, line 20, after "Missouri", to strike out "$125,900" and insert "$132,900".

On page 26, line 22, after "Missouri", to strike out "$248,000" and insert "$261,750".

On page 26, line 24, after "Nebraska", to strike out "$178,700" and insert "$188,600".

On page 27, line 2, after "Nebraska", to strike out "$147,800" and insert "$156,000".

On page 27, line 4, to strike out "$1,889,-100" and insert "$2,061,050".

On page 27, line 6, after "New Hampshire", to strike out "$317,000" and insert "$334,600".

On page 27, line 8, after "New Jersey", to strike out "$133,200" and insert "$140,600".

On page 27, line 10, after "New Jersey", to strike out "$261,800" and insert "$276,350".

On page 27, line 12, to strike out "$12,121,-200" and insert "$12,903,600".

On page 27, line 14, after "New Mexico", to strike out "$319,000" and insert "$336,900".

On page 27, line 16, to strike out "$11,034,-900" and insert "$11,758,950".

On page 27, line 18, after "New York", to strike out "$106,100" and insert "$112,000".

On page 27, line 20, after "North Carolina", to strike out "$105,100" and insert "$110,-950".

On page 27, line 22, after "North Carolina", to strike out "$111,600" and insert "$117,800".

On page 27, line 24, after "North Carolina", to strike out "$274,700" and insert "$289,950".

On page 28, line 2, to strike out "$164,300" and insert "$173,400".

On page 28, line 4, after "North Carolina", to strike out "$101,700" and insert "$107,-350".

On page 28, line 6, after "North Carolina", to strike out "$226,900" and insert "$239,-500".

On page 28, line 8, after "North Carolina", to strike out "$87,300" and insert "$92,250".

On page 28, line 10, after "North Carolina," to strike out "$401,000" and insert "$423,300".

On page 28, line 12, after "North Carolina", to strike out "$151,100" and insert "$159,500".

On page 28, line 14, to strike out "$337,300" and insert "$356,050".

On page 28, line 16, to strike out "$154,400" and insert "$163,000".

On page 28, line 18, to strike out "$107,300" and insert "$113,250".

On page 28, line 20, after "Oklahoma", to strike out "$222,400" and insert "$234,750".

On page 28, line 22, to strike out "$269,500" and insert "$284,450".

On page 28, line 24, to strike out "$174,800" and insert "$184,500".

On page 29, line 2, to strike out "$1,117,800" and insert "$1,238,900".

On page 29, line 4, after "Oregon", to strike out "$195,900" and insert "$206,800".

On page 29, line 6, after "Oregon", to strike out "$252,300" and insert "$266,300".

On page 29, line 8, after "Oregon", to strike out "$125,700" and insert "$132,700".

On page 29, line 10, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$267,800" and insert "$282,700".

On page 29, line 12, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$154,400" and insert "$163,000".

On page 29, line 14, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$151,700" and insert "$160,100".

On page 29, line 16, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$92,300" and insert "$97,400".

On page 29, line 18, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$96,700" and inesrt "$102,050".

On page 29, line 20, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$119,500" and insert "$126,150".

On page 29, line 22, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$151,700" and insert "$160,100".

On page 29, line 24, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$224,400" and insert "$236,850".

On page 30, line 2, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$151,700" and insert "$160,-100".

On page 30, line 4, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$154,400" and insert "$163,-000".

On page 30, line 6, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$182,300" and insert "$192,450".

On page 30, line 8, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$182,300" and insert "$192,450".

On page 30, line 10, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$182,300" and insert "$192,-450".

On page 30, line 12, after "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$96,700" and insert "$107,050".

On page 30, line 14, after "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$181,300" and insert "$191,350".

On page 30, line 16, after "Rhode Island", to strike out "$235,300" and insert "$248,350".

On page 30, line 18, after "South Carolina", to strike out "$87,400" and insert "$92,250".

On page 30, line 20, after "South Carolina", to strike out "$246,500" and insert "$260,-200".

On page 30, line 22, after "South Carolina", to strike out "$91,800" and insert "$96,900".

On page 30, line 24, after "Tennessee", to strike out "$131,800" and insert "$139,100".

On page 31, line 2, to strike out "$86,000" and insert "$90,800".

On page 31, line 4, to strike out "$235,600" and insert $248,700".

On page 31, line 6, to strike out "$168,700" and insert "$178,050".

On page 31, line 8, to strike out "$224,000" and insert "$236,450".

On page 31, line 10, to strike out "$104,100" and insert "$109,900".

On page 31, line 12, after "Texas", to strike out "$279,500" and insert "$295,000".

On page 31, line 14, to strike out "$161,300" and insert "$170,250".

On page 31, line 16, to strike out "$378,000" and insert "$399,000".

On page 31, line 18, after "Vermont", to strike out "$335,000" and insert "$353,600".

On page 31, line 22, after "Washington", to strike out "$120,200" and insert "$126,900".

On page 31, line 23, after "Washington", to strike out "$393,200" and insert "$415,050".

On page 32, line 2, after "Washington", to strike out "$136,700" and insert "$144,300".

On page 32, line 4, after "Washington", to strike out "$6,385,500" and insert $6,857,250".

On page 32, line 6, to strike out "$426,500" and insert "$450,200".

On page 32, line 8, after "Virginia", to strike out "$115,200" and insert "$121,600".

On page 32, line 10, after "Virginia", to strike out "$159,300" and insert "$168,150".

On page 32, line 12, after "Virginia", to strike out "$171,200" and insert "$180,700".

On page 32, line 14, after "Virginia", to strike out "$157,500" and insert "$166,250".

On page 32, line 16, after "West Virginia", to strike out "$232,200" and insert "$245,100".

On page 32, line 18, after "West Virginia", to strike out "$129,300" and insert "$136,500".

On page 32, line 20, after "Wisconsin", to strike out "$152,700" and insert "$161,200".

On page 32, line 22, to strike out "$113,400" and insert "$119,700".

On page 32, line 24, after "Wisconsin", to strike out "$120,800" and insert "$127,500".

On page 33, line 2, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$26,027,100" and insert "27,554,050".

On page 33, line 14, after the figures "$460,-000", to insert "and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the border station facility at Derby Line, Vermont, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962, is hereby increased by $183,000".

On page 33, after line 18, to insert:

"Not to exceed $120,000 heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Construction, Public Buildings Projects', in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, may be transferred to the appropriation for 'Construction, United States Mission Building, New York, New York', for the payment of contractor's claims."

On page 34, after line 2, to insert:

"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, $33,200,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 35, line 7, after the word "law", to strike out "$48,920,000" and insert "$52,-420,000".

On page 35, line 22, after the word "records," to strike out "$14,955,000" and insert "$15,155,000".

On page 36, line 11, to strike out "$5,-465,000" and insert "$5,765,000".

On page 37, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "$2,875,000" and insert "$3,000,-000".

On page 38, line 13, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$1,505,000" and insert "$1,530,000".

On page 39, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$19,565,000" and insert "$21,840,000".

On page 39, after line 17, insert:

"WORKING CAPITAL FUND

"To increase the capital of the working capital fund established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), $100,000."

On page 43, line 8, after the word "vehicles", to insert "including one at not to exceed $4,000 and one"; in line 9, after the word "only", to strike out "$15,525,000" and insert "$15,925,000"; and in line 12, to strike out "$3,250,000" and insert $3,500,000".

On page 44, after line 16, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATIONS

"For necessary expenses in connection with low income housing demonstration projects, as authorized by section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, $50,000."

On page 45, line 23, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$15,484,000" and insert "$16,084,000".

On page 46, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "thirty-eight", and in line 8, after the word "only", to strike out "$25,260,000" and insert "$25,710,000".

On page 46, after line 15, to insert:

"NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

"Research and development

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration $4,413,-594,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 47, after line 4, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For advance planning, design, and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $262,880,500, to remain available until expended."

On page 47, after line 10, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; purchase or hire of not to exceed two aircraft for administrative use; maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase and hire of motor vehicles (including purchse of not to exceed

eighty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which forty shall be for replacement only); and maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; $623,525,500."

At the top of page 48, to insert:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

On page 48, after line 1, to insert:

"Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation."

On page 48, after line 5, to insert:

"Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation 'Administrative Operations' in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive."

On page 48, after line 11, to insert:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without the consent of the Congress."

On page 49, line 9 after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to insert "purchase of one aircraft; maintenance and operation of aircraft;", and in line 11, after the word "vehicles" to insert "and aircraft".

On page 50, line 23, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to insert "hire of motor vehicles;", and on page 51, line 2, after the word "Specialists", to strike out "$39,440,000" and insert "$40,578,000".

On page 51, line 19, after the word "service", to strike out "$155,000,000" and insert "$155,250,000".

On page 52, line 8, after the word "law", to strike out "$14,200,000" and insert "$14,500,000".

On page 52, line 12, after the word "expended", to strike out "$36,000,000" and insert "$38,000,000", and in line 13, after the word "which", to strike out "$1,170,000" and insert "$1,275,000".

On page 54, line 12, after "United States Code", to strike out "$34,600,000" and insert "$39,600,000".

On page 55, line 1, after "United States Code", to strike out "$91,233,000" and insert "$98,733,000".

On page 55, line 15, after the word "expenses", to strike out the comma and "but not to exceed $257,000,000,", and in line 24, after the word "expenses", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That, in addition, not to exceed $200,000,000 of unobligated balances of said Direct loans revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amount as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer."

On page 59, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$3,670,000" and insert "$3,825,000".

On page 65, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$10,375,000", and on page 66, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$78,750,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I anticipate that several amendments will be offered to the bill. Instead of discussing each item in the bill, I suggest that Senators who wish to ask questions about items or submit amendments do so, and then as the questions are asked and amendments are offered they can be considered. I suggest that procedure, rather than going through each appropriation, item by item, because it would take a long time to do so.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado, who is the ranking Republican member of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to make only a remark or two on the bill. First, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for the excellent work which he did on the bill. Undoubtedly questions will be asked about the NASA item, as the chairman has suggested. Although it is rather complicated, because of a technicality in the House of Representatives, it is necessary that the full authorization amount be included in the bill in order that the whole sum may be in conference.

There is one point which the chairman of the committee did not mention, and which I believe is worthy of mention now. For the third year the chairman and the Senator from Colorado in working on the bill have made a great effort to keep increased Government employment down. We have not been able to do that completely but, if my memory serves me correctly, the overall increase in employment in all of the budgets covered by the bill, even for such departments as the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Power Commission, any many others, which are increasing their activities greatly, would be less than 1 percent in all of those agencies, excluding NASA, and in that case we have no realistic way of estimating the employment or the increase in employment. I am sure that the chairman will agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Until the House and the Senate agree on a figure; then we shall know.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know of no Senator who has been more diligent in his work on this very complex bill than the Senator from Colorado.

I do not intend that statement to be in the nature of an apology. But the bill, involving 26 agencies of the Government, is a complex bill. Some are smaller agencies, but they are important. The two large agencies included in the bill are the space agency and the VA, which cost a great deal of money.

Three years ago the Senator from Colorado and other members of the committee, including the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oklahoma, joined the chairman in an endeavor to reduce Government employment. In our sector of Government appropriations we have done so. Last year we showed a decrease. The year before we held the number to about the same level. This year, even with NASA coming into the appropriation, the increase would be less than 1 percent. That is a record of which I believe we can be proud. I hope we can continue that endeavor, because we feel that a great many Government expenditures are caused by the fact that once a great many people are employed, they often run around trying to find some programs in order to keep themselves busy.

Mr. President, the agencies have done excellent work, even without an increase in employment. The Senator from Colorado has done yeoman work on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator. We have made a special effort on the bill; and in view of the complexity of the bill, not only in the sums appropriated, but also with respect to the number of Government employees, the bill which the committee has reported is a good bill.

Those are all the remarks that I wish to make at the present time. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to lend my support to the independent offices appropriation bill as reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member. I have been particularly concerned about the across-the-board reductions made by the other body in construction funds for new buildings. There are six new post office and Federal buildings slated for West Virginia, and they are to be built at Gassaway, Summersville, Glenville, Pineville, Parsons, and White Sulphur Springs.

The best testimony for the action of the Senate committee in restoring 5 percent of the funds was given by Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator for the General Services Administration. He said:

A reduction of 10 percent was applied to 130 small building projects for which the estimated improvement cost included in the GSA estimate averaged $20.29 per square foot gross area. Actual experience in construction contract awards during the past 2 years for five small buildings indicates an average cost of $22 per square foot gross area. There has been a 4-percent increase in the construction cost index since early 1963 when most of the prospectuses were submitted to the Committees on Public Works.

Because of the continuing increase in construction costs we are employing various cost reduction expedients through the specification of cheaper materials so as to give reasonable assurance of construction capability within the estimates included in the GSA 1965 request. Our estimates represent the minimum requirements and because of increasing costs we strongly recommend full restoration of the reductions.

The Senate Appropriations Committee was convinced by this reasoning and believed the smaller buildings could not be constructed with the reduced funds.

Mr. President, these buildings are sorely needed in West Virginia because of the increasing activity of Federal offices in these cities. The existing leased offices are too small and too costly. The Federal Government now pays $89,395 annually for the existing facilities. In other words, the new buildings will have fully paid for themselves in less than 20 years.

There seems to be little need to recount here the stimulus that will be given to a community by a new Federal building. It is great and it is needed in each of the six communities in West Virginia.

I wish, also, to commend the Appropriations Committee for restoring $38,000 for the remodeling of the Bureau of Mines Building at Mount Hope. The expansion will greatly assist the health and safety services of the Bureau to serve the community.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1170 and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, lines 7–9, it is proposed to strike out "including not to exceed $4,300,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, $86,124,000," and insert "$81,824,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment would eliminate the $4.3 million subsidy for helicopter service. Before I discuss the amendment, I wish to join my distinguished colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] in commending the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The independent offices appropriation bill is the most complex appropriation bill that comes before the Senate. The defense appropriation bill is much larger, of course, but the pending bill involves so many agencies that it is extraordinarily complicated. Vital services are provided in the bill. The Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado have rendered distinguished service. They have devoted a great deal of time to the subject. Although my staff and I have gone over the entire bill very carefully, we are most impressed by the excellence of the work that has been done on it. I intend to offer a few amendments. One is an amendment which would eliminate the helicopter subsidy.

Mr. President, there is nothing new about my proposal. A number of Senators have been disturbed for a long time about this subsidy which we feel can be classified as an unnecessary, wasteful frill if any expenditure of the Government can be so called.

Originally, before 1954, the appropriation was conceived as a subsidy that would last 2 or 3 years for an infant industry. It has lasted 11 years and the end is nowhere in sight. In the 1963 report, as well as very often before that, we tried to end the subsidy. We tried to say that in a year or so we would cut it off.

I quote from page 14 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Conference Report of 1963. That report stated:

> The conferees agree that the subsidies for helicopters should be ended shortly, that this service should either be made self-supporting or concluded. It is recommended that the appropriate committees of the Congress give their earnest consideration to this problem in 1963.

I recall very well, as I am sure other Senators do, the discussion, both in committee and on the floor last year, in which it was indicated that there was every intention of bringing the subsidy at long last to a prompt close.

Mr. President, the subsidy started as a $2 million subsidy to the helicopter service, and it has grown steadily.

Who receives the benefit of the subsidy? Only three cities—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Who receives the benefit among the people who live in the cities or travel to the cities? First, only 1 in 7 persons in our population flies. I believe we know that in order to fly, people generally must have a reasonably good income. We are not subsidizing those whose income are so low that they need or deserve subsidies of the kind proposed. We are subsidizing people who are relatively affluent.

Furthermore, only 1 in 20 or 30 persons flies regularly, and only 1 in 1,000 ever uses a helicopter service. Are those 1 in 1,000 poverty stricken?

Let us take a look at where the helicopter service operates. In New York it operates primarily out of Wall Street and goes from Wall Street to La Guardia and Wall Street to the Kennedy International Airport. The helicopter service saves travelers from 20 minutes to 30 minutes, and that is about it. I submit that while those who work on Wall Street and would like to travel around the country deserve consideration, like every other American citizen, that they would be among the first to say that this kind of frill, this kind of subsidy, which is a multimillion dollar subsidy, is not justified, and that people ought to pay their own way when obviously they can afford to do so.

The situation in Chicago is even less justified, because in Chicago there is only one large airport that serves Chicago. It is true that Midway has been opened on a very limited basis in the past few weeks, but we recognize that the O'Hare Airport in Chicago, which is one of the largest in the world, if not the largest, is all that is necessary for the overwhelming majority of people who travel to Chicago.

Moreover, O'Hare Airport is now serviced by a superb system of freeways and tollways, so that travel from O'Hare to downtown Chicago takes about 25 minutes. I have taken it many times. Whatever justification existed before, when it took an hour to reach downtown Chicago, has disappeared.

As to Los Angeles, there is even less justification. There is only one big international airport at Los Angeles. It is true that there are many minor airports that people in business fly to and from. It is convenient for them to have helicopter service. But there is only one airport that serves the overwhelming number of people who fly to Los Angeles.

In all these areas, the helicopter service and the subsidy for it save additional time to air travelers, 30 minutes to a maximum of 1 hour, and in some cases less than that. The Federal subsidy represents more than half the cost of that service. So when a person buys a helicopter ticket in New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles, the Federal Government picks up half the tab for it. Instead of paying $9, he might have to pay $18 or $20, if there were no subsidy.

As I have said, this is a minor amendment in a big bill, but as a symptom and as a symbol of extravagance and waste, it is a very important symbol.

Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of the people do not get the benefit of this subsidy. It is confined to three larger cities and excludes the rest of the country.

I hope the Senate will this time recognize the facts and end this unjustified subsidy that benefits only one in a thousand of our people who travel—people who, can well afford to pay for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is in general agreement with much of what the Senator from Wisconsin has said with respect to the basic facts he has recited. The helicopter service started as a technological experiment in aviation, and has made great progress.

The Board, in its wisdom or lack of wisdom, established, under the law, the service at subsidized rates. It established this subsidized service in three of the major air centers of the United States. The Board found that for a while perhaps the cost was greater than anticipated, or that the use of the service was not as great as anticipated, and that therefore the subsidy would have to be greater; but the Board felt it should continue a worthwhile experiment in the field of aviation in getting people to places they wish to reach by air. The committee has always looked at this item very carefully. It is not a small item. One of these days, we shall either have to eliminate it altogether or find that it is truly worthwhile, and extend it to more cities.

I know of no area that could use helicopter service to greater advantage than the Puget Sound area, where people could go from the airport to certain areas on the peninsula in 10 or 15 minutes, when it would require 4 or 5 hours to reach by automobile or by boat.

The Board stated that the House amount of $3 million would not take care of the three services, and that the Board had ordered subsidy rates for the three helicopter carriers aggregating $4.3 million a year, which rates were determined by the Board in accordance with the criteria set forth in section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act. Like all other subsidy rates, the helicopter rates, which establish an annual subsidy of $800,000 for Chicago, $1.6 million for Los Angeles, and $1.9 million for New York, are effective for an indefinite period into the future and will extend into fiscal year 1965, and beyond, unless or until challenged by one or more of the carriers, or reopened by the Board on its own initiative.

We have suggested to the Board that, on its own initiative, it examine into the question of helicopter service and recommend that either it be installed in other places that might be worthwhile, or eliminated altogether.

Last year, at the request of the committee, a task force engaged in a comprehensive field analysis of helicopter operations, which would, upon completion,

be carefully considered by the Board and reported to the committee. The task force concluded the field portion of its study late in April 1964, and its findings were carefully considered by the Board.

The two major objectives of the task force were, first, to appraise helicopter services from every vantage point; and second, to assist in developing a current long-range subsidy program for helicopter services. The outline of such a program was set forth in the Board's June 1963 report to President Kennedy, entitled "Airline Subsidy Reduction Program." In that report it was estimated that approximately $26 million of subsidy would be required to support the three currently subsidized helicopter services during the 6-year period from fiscal 1963 to 1968, inclusive, with a steady downward progression in the aggregate subsidy payment, so that the total for fiscal 1968 would have been reduced to $3 million. It was noted that, on the basis of currently known facts, it is believed that worthwhile experimentation with the three carriers in this field cannot realistically be expected to continue with a subsidy aggregating substantially less than that set forth in the report.

On that basis, and on the basis that the Board had obligated itself, the committee recommended the minimum amount suggested.

It is true that the New York helicopter service lands in Wall Street, but it is not true that the service is for the benefit of those who live in Wall Street. Anyone can use the service. I suspect that most of those who have used the helicopter service are travelers. People coming from Europe to Kennedy Airport use the helicopter service back and forth, to get to and from New York. Then they may use the subway to get where they are going. There is the biggest air traffic in the world there. The helicopters happen to land in Wall Street because it is the only really open area that has proved to be safe.

I had occasion to go up there about a month ago with the President of the United States. We took a helicopter from Kennedy Airport. We were going to Connecticut, but had to land in Wall Street, and then take automobiles to go through New York. So although Wall Street is a bad name, it has not much to do with the helicopter service. I doubt that it is used very much by people who are on Wall Street. It is used by travelers.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to complete my statement. Then I will yield.

The Senator from Wisconsin is correct. I have discussed this subject with the Senator from Colorado. Perhaps helicopter service is to become a part of the integrated service furnished by airlines. Perhaps an airline will add helicopters to its fleet of airships, of which it has many. Perhaps, for example, when an airplane lands at the Seattle Airport, it will furnish helicopter service so that passengers can complete their travel by air transportation.

That would put it in the general subsidy with local service transport airlines, which how serve 657 cities in the United States. That may be necessary. It was started as an experiment. Helicopter services have greatly advanced. I can remember the time when the Secret Service would not allow the President of the United States to get into a helicopter. Now helicopters are used every day by anyone and everyone, even by those who require maximum security. Great advances have been made. They have a future in local transport systems in the United States, even in urban transportation. On that basis we should go ahead. It is easy to pick out New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. However, it must be remembered that we made the start at the three great areas of air transportation, to see how the service would work.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that probably these lines ought to charge more. I have suggested, as has the Senator from Colorado, that more be charged for the postal service. The subsidy charge would be much lower if the post office would pay the helicopter operators a reasonable rate. They haul all kinds of mail. The great bulk of their service is hauling airmail between airports. If the post office would pay the helicopter operators what they normally pay for contractual services, the subsidy would not have to be as large as it is. For some reason or other the post office pays so much per ton, rather than per pound.

The Senator from Colorado and I agree that there is ample engineering proof, by people who are objective, that the operating costs will be much lower in the future. In other words, we have reached a plateau. We have high hopes that costs will continue to go down. If the Post Office Department would pay regular rates for hauling the mail, the subsidy could be much lower.

I wished to make this explanation, because in some respects I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. However, we had a job to do. As a lawyer, I believe that the carriers people could go into court if they wished to do so under their certificate, and the Court of Claims would allow the amount they are entitled to, because they hold a certificate from a Federal agency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, although I am from New York, I am sympathetic with the position of the Senator from Wisconsin. I can understand perfectly how he feels. He has raised this question upon several occasions. Raising such questions creates a serious consciousness of Federal expenditure policy and facilitates an accounting of the operations of our Government. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has pointed out that many improvements have been made in helicopter services. What I would like to say deals with two fundamentals. First, I point out that the Wall Street stop is only one of the stops used by the helicopter service in New York. The major service is between Newark and Kennedy International Airports. That is because they are so far apart. Because of the traffic density, a 2½-hour trip by automobile is necessary, even though on the map the distance appears to be quite short.

The real justification for the helicopter subsidy is the knowledge we gain from commercial operation of an important means of transportation. As we all know, transportation is one of the really critical problems of our Nation and our world.

I see the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in the Chamber. Recently the Senate passed the mass transportation bill, of which he was in charge on the floor. He is very much aware of these complex problems. A remarkable breakthrough has been made with helicopter transportation. Today the helicipter performs an essential role in military air-ground support operations.

The helicopter operators claim—and I believe justly so—that a great deal of what was learned about fuel economy, operational safety, and technical operations in the daily attrition of commercial operation has been extremely valuable to the military forces. It's value has been estimated at $70 million as against the total subsidy of $46 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the commercial helicopter service at New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, is only a part of the commercial helicopter operation? There is also a helicopter operation in San Francisco, which is a substantial operation, and it has been operated without any subsidy. The same is true of other cities, including Milwaukee.

Mr. JAVITS. I would challenge the Senator's use of the word "substantial." In order to gain some real experience in this field it is necessary to have daily service, with the attrition that is involved.

I heard the Senator speak about the subsidy. The important difference is that these operators are losing money. In New York a major company lost three-quarters of a million dollars. They want to be self-sufficient. They have succeeded in selling half of their public offering of debentures, made in order to raise capital, and they are going ahead in a determined way. What happens here today will determine whether they can continue to formulate their plans for the future. What I like about the situation today is that the CAB apparently believe that the subsidy may be able to end after a 5-year period. This period is described at page 1019 of the record of hearings of the subcommittee. This provides, at long last, a definite commitment on this situation. For myself, without being parochial about New York, I believe that the judgment of the committee and the judgment of the CAB is that the evidence shows a breakthrough in this form of transportation.

The proposal before us stands up in terms of national interest. I appreciate the position of the Senator from Wisconsin. He goads us on; he stirs us up. However, I believe the case the commit-

tee has made justifies the continuance of the present subsidy. The matter has received serious consideration by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that the leadership wishes to discuss another subject. Therefore, I shall not reply to the Senator from New York at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the question has been raised that this service involves only three metropolitan centers. It is not a question of the center that is involved; it is a question of where the need exists. In Chicago, Midway Airport has been deactivated. That was done some years back. Now the heavy traffic load at O'Hare Airport is such that Midway has been reactivated.

Helicopter service is almost an indispensable service in getting people back and forth between these two airports. We have saved enough on military costs to offset what is involved. If we reduce the amount in the bill we shall not only cripple the service, but come close to killing it.

Mr. JAVITS. And the operators will be put in a position in which they can never become self-sufficient.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. This will be a live quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 515 Leg.]

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Allott	Hill	Muskie
Bartlett	Holland	Nelson
Bayh	Hruska	Neuberger
Beall	Humphrey	Pastore
Bennett	Inouye	Pearson
Bible	Jackson	Pell
Boggs	Javits	Prouty
Burdick	Johnston	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Case	Keating	Robertson
Church	Kuchel	Russell
Clark	Lausche	Saltonstall
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cotton	Long, La.	Simpson
Curtis	Magnuson	Smathers
Dirksen	Mansfield	Smith
Dodd	McCarthy	Sparkman
Dominick	McClellan	Stennis
Douglas	McGee	Symington
Eastland	McGovern	Thurmond
Ellender	McIntyre	Tower
Ervin	McNamara	Walters
Fong	Mechem	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Gore	Miller	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Morton	
Hayden	Moss	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF in the chair). A quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM CALIFORNIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of appointment of the Senator-designate from California, and ask that it be read.

The certificate of appointment was read, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of California, I, Edmund G. Brown, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint Pierre Emil George Salinger a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Clair Engle, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, and seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, Calif., this 4th day of August, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of the State of California.
FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
By WALTER C. STUTLER,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I assume that under the rules of the Senate, and under the Constitution of the United States, the certificate of appointment is subject to challenge.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment is in the form required by the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am speaking now as to the validity of the certificate of appointment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will have to make a specific challenge. The Chair cannot rule until that is done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That I shall do, but I am only asking whether this is the appropriate time to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Illinois wishes to challenge the validity of the certificate of appointment, this is the appropriate time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of quite a number of citizens in California, including the Republican candidate for U.S. Senator, Mr. George Murphy, I have been requested to protest the validity of the certificate of appointment which is now being submitted on behalf of the appointee who would presently present himself to take the oath as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. President, in so doing, I should emphasize the fact that this in no way involves the acceptability or character of the appointee. This challenge goes clearly to the question of the legality of the certificate of appointment by the Governor of California. I wish to emphasize that, so that there can be no question about it.

There are some telegrams that perhaps I should read into the RECORD. The first one was sent to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I believe mainly because of the statement which was made and published in the newspapers of California.

I hold a telegram in my hand from Mr. George Murphy. With the permission of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I shall read it into the RECORD:

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON,
Democrat, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have been quoted in the Los Angeles Times as stating that the California election laws do not apply in the case of Pierre Salinger and that the Senate is vested with the sole right of passing on the qualifications of its Members you are of course exactly right. The case in point however does not deal with the seating of Senator. It deals with the appointment of a qualified elector of the State of California to fulfill the unexpired term of Senator Engle. This is not a question of the acceptability of an elected Senator. This is a question which has to do with the appointment by the Governor of California which most definitely is controlled by the election code of the State. I bring this to your attention not only as a candidate for the U.S. Senate but as a citizen of California who intends to see that the laws of our State are upheld. I am sure that some of the confusion in this incident was the cause of your statement and I am sending you this information merely to clear up what I am sure was a misunderstanding.

GEORGE MURPHY.

Mr. President, I feel impelled as a matter of duty to challenge and to pursue this matter—not at undue length because of what has happened, and I am sure it has happened, in the State of California this morning—and I read a telegram, also from Mr. George Murphy, addressed to me:

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN,
Washington, D.C.

Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike throughout California have urged me to pursue the legal and constitutional questions raised by Governor Brown's latently political appointment of Mr. Salinger, a resident of Virginia, to the U.S. Senate from California. I am doing just that. Wednesday morning, prior to Mr. Salinger's swearing-in ceremonies in Washington, a respected and distinguished Los Angeles law firm of Gibson, Dun & Crutcher will file a petition for a writ of mandate. This action requests the superior court to order the Governor to vacate, annul, set aside, and recall the Senate appointment of Mr. Salinger on the grounds that it is illegal according to the California elections code. We anticipate the matter will be heard on or about August 17, 1964. Our law clearly, specifically, and rightfully states that the Governor cannot appoint a man to the U.S. Senate from California who has not been a resident of this State for at least 1 year. Let there be no confusion on this action. This has no relation to the previous legal question which arose when many citizens protested Mr. Sal-

inger's original move to have his name on the primary ballot. This is an entirely separate legal problem. As a resident of California I am concerned that the Governor has ignored both ethics and law to appoint Mr. Salinger, a man who has not lived, voted, or paid taxes in California for nearly 10 years.

GEORGE MURPHY.

Mr. President, I now read into the RECORD a telegram from the law firm of Gibson, Dun & Crutcher, attorneys for George Murphy. This is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

At the request of George Murphy, we are preparing and will file at 8 a.m. P.d.t. tomorrow in Los Angeles County, Calif., Superior Court petition of George Murphy for writ of mandate directing the Governor of California to vacate, annul, set aside, and recall the purported appointment of Pierre Salinger to the U.S. Senate and the purported commission granted to him this date upon the ground that said acts of the Governor contravene the provisions of the 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution and of the applicable provisions of the California statutes adopted pursuant thereto. Concurrently there will be filed a notice of Mr. Murphy's intention to apply to the court for the issuance of such writ at 9:30 a.m. P.d.t., on August 17, 1964, in department 65 of said court. Copies of these documents will be mailed to you tonight airmail special delivery.

GIBSON, DUN & CRUTCHER,
Attorneys for George Murphy.

Mr. President, I also read into the RECORD a similar telegram that has been addressed to me. It reads as follows:

At the request of George Murphy, we will file at 8 a.m. P.d.t., tomorrow in Los Angeles County, Calif., Superior Court petition of George Murphy for writ of mandate directing the Governor of California to vacate, annul, set aside, and recall the purported appointment of Pierre Salinger to the U.S. Senate and the purported commission granted to him this date, upon the ground that said acts of the Governor contravene the provisions of the 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution and of the applicable provisions of the California statutes adopted pursuant thereto. Concurrently there will be filed a notice of Mr. Murphy's intention to apply to the court for the issuance of such writ at 9:30 a.m. P.d.t., on August 17, 1964, in department 65 of said court. Copies of these documents will be mailed to you tonight airmail special delivery.

OVERTON, LYMAN & PRINCE,
Attorneys for George Murphy.

I have before me a number of telegrams from citizens of California, protesting the appointment on the ground that it is not valid under California law. Only one issue is involved. It is not the character of the appointee. It is not his acceptability. Nothing personal is involved.

First, it is a clear and patent fact that section 25001 of the California Code is as clear as crystal that an appointee by the Governor must be an elector. Anyone who wants to take the trouble can verify it if he pleases, or I can read the provision. I have the section before me.

Second, article 2, section 1 of the California Code provides that any elector "must be a resident for 1 year before the day of election."

I believe it is quite generally conceded that the appointee who will be presented to the bar of the Senate was not a resident of California for a period of 1 year. Therefore, under the code definition he does not qualify as an elector as defined by the California Code. By way of justification for the acceptance of this certificate and the approval of the nominee or appointee, so that he can take his seat, there is reference to article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

The pertinent language there is this:

No person shall be a Senator * * * who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

If that is all they were relying upon, I do not believe one could make a case. The word "inhabitant" might mean someone who has probably lived there for a day, a week, a month, or a longer period of time. But there is another provision of the Constitution that has a very explicit bearing on the matter. I refer to the 17th amendment.

It provides as follows:

The legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointment until the people fill the vacancy by election as the legislature may direct.

There is no inherent power as such to make an appointment by the Governor unless that authority is conferred. I believe in the State of Wisconsin—and I am not absolutely sure about it—an appointment can actually not be made. But when the legislature provides that the Governor can make a temporary appointment to fill a vacancy in the Senate, then of course the power of the legislature comes into play. The legislature can grant the power. It can withhold the power. It can destroy the power. And the Governor would then be powerless to make any appointment whatsoever.

So the Constitution, through the 17th amendment, clearly recognizes that the legislature of a State can prescribe a condition under which an appointment can be made and considered by the Senate of the United States. The legislature has so empowered the Governor. It has prescribed that the appointee be "an elector." The legislature has defined an elector as one who has resided in the State for a period of 1 year before election. That is the basis for the writ of mandate—in other jurisdictions known as a writ of mandamus—that is filed in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. That obviously places this certificate in issue. The matter ought to be then resolved accordingly.

Under rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, an acceptable form is provided:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of—

Then the Governor signs the certificate.

In the form that we use to be presented in the case of any appointee, there is a clear reference to the fact that the Governor relies not merely on the Constitution of the United States, but also upon the laws of the State as well.

The law of California is abundantly clear. The Governor can only appoint an elector. The code defines an elector as one who has resided in the State for a year. The person who presents himself to the bar of the Senate for the oath has concededly not been a resident of the State of California for a year. So by virtue of the 17th amendment, by virtue of the California code, by virtue of the requirement in rule VI of the rules of the Senate with respect to the certificate, by virtue of the action filed this morning in the Los Angeles Superior Court, and all other considerations that are involved, I feel that it is incumbent upon me, as the minority leader, to move that the appointment be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that the committee be instructed to report back at some ascertained date. At this point I think I ought to query the majority leader.

We have been discussing the question of fixing a day when the subject might be reported back to the Senate. So far as I am concerned, a week would be sufficient. My only difficulty is that the question has been set down for hearing on the merits—or at least that will be the request—on August 17, which is more than a week hence. It would require 13 days, I suppose, to meet that time schedule, because there will be a resolution of the case on its merits in the courts of California. I must present the question to the majority leader, because I cannot quite determine whether or not we could refer the question to the Committee on Rules and Administration for only a week and still satisfy all the requirements and considerations involved. The situation offers me difficulty. So I first wish to submit the question to the majority leader.

Obviously and properly the majority leader will offer a substitute motion for the motion that I have presented. While I have not seen the substitute, I would have to presume from past experience that the majority leader would ask that the appointee be allowed to take the oath and to take his seat in the Senate without prejudice, then sending the question to the Committee on Rules and Administration. But once it is referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, without it having been resolved in the courts of California, and without it having been resolved by proper investigation and report by the Committee on Rules and Administration, I think the case would be closed.

I believe that my original motion ought to prevail, in view of the fact that litigation in California is pending. We cannot blink at that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I realize the position in which the distinguished minority leader finds himself. I sympathize with him. I know there is nothing personally involved; and were I in his position, I would act in exactly the same circumstances.

But I believe there is another side to this picture which ought to be brought to the attention of the Senate before I offer my substitute.

Acting under the authority vested in him by the laws of California, Elections Code, division 13, chapter 1, section 25001, Gov. Edmund (Pat) Brown has appointed Pierre Salinger to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Clair Engle.

by an abuse of his trust, either through misapprehension or design, might assume the appointing power to the exclusion of the legislature.

That was back in the days when the legislature made the appointment. But one can see how easily this could be phrased to cover the case before us. One can see how easily this could read: "That if this were not so, a Governor by an abuse of his trust, either through misapprehension or design"—and I might say I am sure it is not design; it would be misapprehension or poor advice by his legal counsel—"might assume the appointing power to the exclusion of the laws passed by the Legislature of the State of California."

That is the problem facing the U.S. Senate, as I view it. We have the power. The question is, Should we exercise it? I suggest that it would be very embarrassing to the appointee in this case if he were seated and then, as a result of the findings of the committee, it were necessary to advise him that it was too bad, but that he was not found to be qualified and he would have to resign his seat.

I suggest that it would be very embarrassing to the U.S. Senate and to every Senator here if we should go ahead and seat him, and at a later date it is decided by the courts of California that we did not know what we were talking about, that the laws of the State of California meant exactly what they said, and that we made a big "boo-boo." I do not believe it will satisfy my conscience to take that risk, certainly not until after a committee has had a chance to explore this more exhaustively than I have been able to.

I hold nothing personal at all toward the appointee, nor toward the Governor of the State of California. All I am interested in doing is seeing to it that the American people have confidence in the integrity, the wisdom, and the soundness of the U.S. Senate. I believe that if the American people were to read the same statutes that have been cited here today, they would begin to wonder what is going on in the U.S. Senate, if we were to seat this gentleman without at least having had some interpretation from the courts of the State of California.

I regret that the motion by the distinguished majority leader has not been put without an amendment or a substitute motion being made. I feel compelled to vote against the substitute motion. I hope that it will be defeated, and that the motion of the distinguished minority leader will be adopted.

If the pending substitute motion is agreed to, it will be agreed to by those who vote for it with full recognition that the courts in California may well decide that we have made a horrible mistake—not that we did not have the power to do so, but that we abused the discretionary use of that power.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I feel compelled to vote for the substitute motion.

I was appointed on March 12, 1945, to the U.S. Senate by the then Gov. Fred G. Aandahl to succeed the late John Moses.

My appointment to the Senate at that time was clearly in violation of the State constitution of North Dakota. I was appointed on the basis that the Congress of the United States is the sole judge of the qualifications of any of its Members and took precedence over any provision in our constitution or statutes. May I read article 51 of the constitution of North Dakota. It reads as follows:

> The Governor or an officer of this State, or any manager or executive head, or other person employed either directly or indirectly in any department, bureau, commission, institution, or industry of this State, or any member of any State board shall not appoint a member of the legislative assembly to any civil office or employment of any nature whatsoever, during the term for which said member of the legislative assembly shall have been elected. No member of the legislative assembly shall accept any such appointment to civil office or other employment during the term for which he was elected.

Mr. President, if I were to vote against the substitute motion, I would be admitting that Governor Aandahl had no right to appoint me to the U.S. Senate, and that the Congress of the United States did not have the sole jurisdiction to judge as to the qualification of Members of the Senate. No one in North Dakota ever questioned the right of Governor Aandahl to appoint me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Only for purposes of clarification, my original motion is a simple motion to refer the entire question, including the certificate, to the Committee on Rules and Administration without seating the appointee.

The substitute offered by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], would allow the appointee to take his seat, and then the question would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration with instructions to report back to the Senate by August 13.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana in the nature of a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 516 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Bartlett	Humphrey	Nelson
Bayh	Inouye	Neuberger
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Burdick	Johnston	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Church	Kuchel	Randolph
Clark	Lausche	Ribicoff
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Douglas	Long, La.	Russell
Eastland	Magnuson	Smathers
Ellender	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ervin	McClellan	Stennis
Fulbright	McGovern	Symington
Gore	McIntyre	Thurmond
Gruening	McNamara	Walters
Hart	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Monroney	Yarborough
Hayden	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Hill	Moss	Young, Ohio
Holland	Muskie	

NAYS—29

Aiken	Dominick	Mundt
Allott	Fong	Pearson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Boggs	Hruska	Saltonstall
Carlson	Javits	Scott
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cooper	Keating	Smith
Cotton	Mechem	Tower
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Morton	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Cannon	McCarthy
Beall	Edmondson	McGee
Brewster	Goldwater	Talmadge
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy	

So Mr. MANSFIELD's amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the motion of Mr. DIRKSEN, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as amended by the substitute of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The motion, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the oath be administered to Mr. SALINGER without prejudice, and that the credentials be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration with instructions to consider all matters pertaining to the said appointment and to report back not later than August 13.

Mr. SALINGER, escorted by Mr. KUCHEL, advanced to the Vice President's desk and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN], and was subscribed by him.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes, so that we may greet our new colleague.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wanted to make a brief statement before the Senate recessed. I sent for the record of the debate on the seating of our distinguished colleague from North Dakota, who was a member of the legislature of that State when a vacancy occurred. The State had a law that no member of the legislature could be appointed a U.S. Senator. He was appointed a U.S. Senator, and the Senate voted to confirm that appointment. I could not obtain the record in time to make that statement before.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I renew my request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

On the expiration of the recess at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1172. An act for the relief of Rolando de la Torre Arceo and John Anthony Arceo;

H.R. 1262. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maisie Magdalene Lim Ketchens;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Lucia Salvucci;

H.R. 1534. An act for the relief of Lam Chong;

H.R. 2855. An act relating to the application of the manufacturers excise tax on electric light bulbs in the case of sets or strings of such bulbs;

H.R. 3747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pavica Labetic;

H.R. 5154. An act for the relief of Wilfredo Lacar de Leon;

H.R. 5155. An act for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppa D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno;

H.R. 5510. An act for the relief of Carmela Macaro;

H.R. 6040. An act for the relief of Chrisoula Baker;

H.R. 6093. An act for the relief of Lee Chung Woo;

H.R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cesira Doddy;

H.R. 7178. An act for the relief of William O'Connor Swainson;

H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of Vula Roed;

H.R. 8050. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax-exempt status for nonprofit nurses' professional registries operated by nurses' professional associations;

H.R. 8399. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edeltraud Englisch Franklin;

H.R. 9290. An act for the relief of Danny Hiromi Oyama;

H.R. 9361. An act for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast;

H.R. 9519. An act for the relief of Young Soon Kim and Tai Ung Choi;

H.R. 9560. An act for the relief of Lim Sam Soon;

H.R. 9561. An act for the relief of Moni Parvanoff Floroff;

H.R. 9680. An act for the relief of Kil Ja Ahn;

H.R. 10200. An act to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10216. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel de Socarraz;

H.R. 11064. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Virginia;

H.R. 11652. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Supreme Council, 33d Degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction—Prince Hall Affiliation;

H.J. Res. 1048. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; and

H.J. Res. 1115. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1172. An act for the relief of Rolando de la Torre Arceo and John Anthony Arceo;

H.R. 1262. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maisie Magdalene Lim Ketchens;

H.R. 1322. An act for the relief of Lucia Salvucci;

H.R. 1534. An act for the relief of Lam Chong;

H.R. 3747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pavica Labetic;

H.R. 5154. An act for the relief of Wilfredo Lacar de Leon;

H.R. 5155. An act for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppa D'Anquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Bendicto D'Aquanno;

H.R. 5510. An act for the relief of Carmela Macaro;

H.R. 6040. An act for the relief of Chrisoula Baker;

H.R. 6093. An act for the relief of Lee Chung Woo;

H.R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cesira Doddy;

H.R. 7178. An act for the relief of William O'Connor Swainson;

H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of Vula Roed;

H.R. 8399. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edeltraud Englisch Franklin;

H.R. 9290. An act for the relief of Danny Hiromi Oyama;

H.R. 9361. An act for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast;

H.R. 9519. An act for the relief of Young Soon Kim and Tai Ung Choi;

H.R. 9560. An act for the relief of Lim Sam Soon;

H.R. 9561. An act for the relief of Moni Parvanoff Floroff;

H.R. 9680. An act for the relief of Kil Ja Ahn;

H.R. 10200. An act to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 10216. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel de Socarraz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2855. An act relating to the application of the manufacturers excise tax on electric light bulbs in the case of sets or strings of such bulbs; and

H.R. 8050. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax-exempt status for nonprofit nurses' professional registries operated by nurses' professional associations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 11652. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Supreme Council, 33d Degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction—Prince Hall Affiliation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.J. Res. 1048. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; and

H.J. Res. 1115. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand; to the Committee on Armed Services.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, prior to the discussion and swearing in ceremony of the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER], the Senate was discussing the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, which, in effect, would eliminate from the bill the subsidy for helicopter operations in the cities of Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. I do not know whether Senators who are interested in the subject have concluded their remarks. I have concluded mine. I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] believes that there is a great deal of merit to the argument that the subsidy should be eliminated, but his personal conviction is that it should be extended. In his opinion the answer seems to be that it should not be confined to Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York, but should be extended to other cities. He

points the need for it in the Puget Sound area. I could make the same argument for service in Milwaukee. The same argument could be made with respect to many cities in the South, as well as other parts of the country.

It is obvious that if the subsidy is extended, which started at $2 million and which has now been increased to $4,300,000, it will go up and up and up to $20 or $30 or $40 or $50 million, without end.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for the fight he is making. I have been a Member of this body for many years, and I have seen a subsidy of almost every kind, shape, form, and description, based on reasoning that covered a wide spectrum of pleading for special favors from the American taxpayer. What is asked for here is the most inexcusable kind of handout and subsidy in the entire history of the U.S. Government. That is my opinion. The subsidy has been in effect for a number of years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Since 1954.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has been in operation for 11 years. It started as an aid to an infant industry, to enable it to gain some experience and to demonstrate the practicability of using helicopter service between airports in the larger cities. Since that time it has been increased to $4 or $5 million. It was cut back in one year, as I recall—I believe last year, or the year before last, when the conferees, in signing the report, indicated their desire that the subsidy be eliminated.

If there is anything worth learning from the operation of helicopters between airports, it has been learned by now.

New reasons have been brought forward every year. Last year the reason was that there was a new type of helicopter, and it was said, "Let us continue it for 2 more years, with this new type helicopter, and we shall understand it thoroughly."

This industry not only has been subsidized directly by this handout, for which we cannot find any justification whatever, but it has also benefited to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars which the Defense Department has spent in research and development and testing helicopters.

Mr. PROXMIRE. One argument which was made against the amendment and in favor of the subsidy was that it is worth a great deal to the Armed Forces, because the helicopter service provides an opportunity for the armed services to study how the helicopter would operate under great stress; and the argument was made that the commercial helicopter operators, who receive the subsidy, are serving the armed services. The distinguished Senator from Georgia is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and undoubtedly is the outstanding expert in this field. How does he feel about that argument?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has no validity. If it had not been made by a Senator of the United States, it would be silly and ridiculous. I do not know which Senator made it. It has no validity whatever. There are literally thousands of helicopters operating today in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. They operate under every conceivable condition and for every conceivable purpose. There is a wide variety in styles and types of helicopters that are operating in all branches of the armed services. Instead of this limited operation benefiting the Department of Defense, one of the principal subsidies these operators have received has been in the work that has been done by the Department of Defense in this area. This is a handout, pure and simple. It may have had some justification during the first 3 or 4 years of its life, but it has absolutely none today.

Another point is that as long as these three companies in three large cities have their certificates and receive this subsidy, they prevent the certification of other helicopter companies in other cities where the service is needed just as much as it is in those three cities. The Civil Aeronautics Board will not certify other companies, because to do so, would, of course, cut them in on the subsidy.

It is not only a subsidy, but a monopoly as well. It takes on all the bad aspects of combinations in this country that we have sought to prevent.

I commend the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not believe he will succeed. There is some persuasive spirit in the Senate that induces Senators to vote for it. It is not only a subsidy, but it is the most inexcusable one that Congress has ever granted.

I commend the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have before me the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1965, held by the committee in the House of Representatives. At page 693 of this document appears the statement that for the year 1963 the total revenue of the three helicopter companies was $8,635,000. Of that amount $5 million was provided by way of subsidy.

That would mean that practically 70 percent of the income, or at least 65 percent of the income, was by way of subsidy. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin regarding these figures?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was true that year. However, I understand that this year the House provided $3 million. The Senate has increased it to $4,300,000. It has been made clear in the committee hearings that we should either give $4,300,000 or nothing, because the $3 million figure cannot be used; it would be impossible to operate with that figure. Therefore, $4,300,000 is the amount to be granted. It is somewhat less than it was in the past, much more than it should be, and far more than when the subsidy began a few years ago.

It is very close to half of the gross revenues of this subsidized commercial line. At that time it was more than half, but at the present time it is $4.3 million, with half the revenues. Gross revenues of helicopter services have increased by reason of the World's Fair. They have also increased in Los Angeles and, I presume, in Chicago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The figures show that for 1959 the gross revenues of these companies was $7,162,000, with $4,800,000 provided by the United States. That would be more than 66 percent provided by the Government.

In 1960, gross revenues were $88,340,000, with $4,930,000—again, more than 66 percent—provided by way of subsidy.

The figures for 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 are practically identical. For every dollar that is taken in by way of revenue, $2 is given by the taxpayers to operate this deluxe service between airports in the cities of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I strongly commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his amendment. I shall support it. I support it for, perhaps, a reason that is a little different from some that have been stated.

First, the practice is highly discriminatory. In my State are two busy airports, quite close together. One is Miami International, the other is Fort Lauderdale International. They merit, as much as any other two airports that I know of, the extension of this service to them. Of course, it is denied them, so long as the three preferred air locations—Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York—have a stranglehold on the operation.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has mentioned the situation in his own State, and I am sure it is a worthy one.

I mention one here, involving the Nation's Capital. There are three airports—National Airport, Dulles Airport, and Friendship Airport—serving 3½ million people who are residents, besides the tremendous visitation, back and forth, of the people of the Nation who come here. No extension of helicopter service is proposed to this area. The illustrations could be continued at length.

Not long ago, I went from Fort Worth to Dallas, which, as I recall, is a distance of 20 or 30 miles. Each city has a fine, large airport. No such helicopter service is made available there. A tremendous amount of traffic moves through both airports.

Discrimination of this kind cannot be continued on a justified basis. It may have been justified as an experiment, but it certainly is not justified any more, considering the rapid growth of air travel and the fact that so many other areas qualify for such service.

The second point I wish to make is that when the helicopter company representatives appeared before the committee—I have not been a member of the committee as long as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has, but I have been a member of the subcommittee for some years—for 2 or 3 years they

said to us, "If you will extend the subsidy for 1 or 2 years, we shall be able to acquire new helicopters. With them, we are sure that we can operate advantageously and profitably." They did not have even that excuse this year. To the contrary, instead of reaching that early day which they prophesied and promised heretofore, the day of termination of the subsidies, they are now talking about extending the subsidies more and more.

The operation cannot bear up under close inspection. As the Senator from New Jersey has said, it is one of the worst, one of the most discriminatory, one of the most extravagant subsidies in the Nation. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Florida for his strong statement in support of the amendment.

I should like to address myself to the Senator from New York. Did I correctly understand him to say that the New York helicopter firm lost $750,000 last year?

Mr. JAVITS. I did not say "last year." I shall quote from the prospectus of the New York Airways Co., filed with Securities and Exchange Commission on June 3, 1964, for the public offering of debentures which states that "under the subsidy rates in effect for the last several years, New York Airways has already suffered operating losses aggregating more than three-quarters of a million dollars."

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are several reasons for that. One is that last year New York Airways had a particularly disastrous experience. It had a spectacular crash, in which a number of fatalities occurred. This forced the company to discontinue service for several weeks. It suffered a great loss of equipment. There was also a serious reduction in the service which could have been rendered during that period, and also in subsequent weeks, because many people would not fly because the helicopter crash had frightened them away from the use of the service.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to cite more of the figures in the prospectus. The exact evidence is the best. I quote from the prospectus dated June 3, 1964:

> The company has operated at a loss in each of its last 3 fiscal years and has never paid a dividend. As of December 31, 1963, the company's current liabiilties exceeded its current assets by $203,003, and it had a deficit in retained earnings of $127,625.

I point out, too, that what I was arguing a little while ago about experience was in the field of mass transport. The reason that I also made reference to the military experience with helicopters was to demonstrate the great importance of this breakthrough in transportation with respect to its military application and to point out, also, the helicopter's important role in military activity, especially in Vietnam.

The argument concerning the helicopter's transportation capacity has been made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I think it is sound. As cities spread out, there will be more and more need for this kind of transportation. Hours will be saved in automobile travel. For example, in the New York area, a vacation home is one that is as far as 100 miles away. Some are even farther away than that. In western areas, I think that is even more true. That is desirable. Very soon, it will not be possible to get into New York through Kennedy or Newark. It will be necessary to use airports much farther away. My guess is that it will be as much as from 50 to 70 miles away. A number of them are now being discussed. That will make helicopter operations infinitely more important.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The arguments the Senator from New York makes are strong and persuasive; but if the situation in New York can provide a better market for helicopters, let that be proved in the commercial market, by showing that they can do a better job than other means of transportation. If one of the reasons for locating an airport 50 or 70 miles away from New York is on the assumption that the Federal Government will subsidize helicopter operations indefinitely, this is a most unfortunate factor.

If the Senate should act promptly—today—and end the helicopter subsidy, there would be an adjustment in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles based on the market facts of life. The fact is that we expect commercial companies that operate at a profit to be able to meet the competitive test. That is not being done with helicopters in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. For 11 long years they have been subsidized.

The Senator from New York knows perfectly well, as he said, that if a firm has operated for 3 years at a loss, even though it has enjoyed subsidies of more than $11 million a year, or has lost money in every year, it is time for Congress to end the experiment.

If the helicopter cannot prove itself on the present basis, some other realistic adjustment will have to be made in New York, and New York will have to operate on the same basis as other cities of our Nation, with the exception of Los Angeles and Chicago.

Mr. JAVITS. The airlines in other cities of the Nation are operating with subsidies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Not helicopters.

Mr. JAVITS. Feeder airlines and other kinds of airlines. I should like to find out how we are going to solve these transportation problems in the big cities.

In other words, if we subsidize the growing of farm commodities, no matter how much money the farmer has lost, that is moral; but when we get into the cities, earning wealth and producing taxes, and we wish to give them a small subsidy to keep them from strangulation, that has suddenly become highly immoral.

The very gentlemen who plead for subsidies by the hundreds of millions of dollars stand up and say, "Oh, no; this is very wasteful. This is $4 million. We cannot afford it."

Let me point out to the Senator from Wisconsin that on page 1019 of the record of the hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say, on that point, that I and a number of other Senators have supported urban renewal, have supported the housing program, and have supported the poverty program—perhaps not to the same extent as the Senator from New York, but there has not been any lack of generosity on the part of Congress toward the big cities.

It is true that the big cities have not obtained everything they have asked for, but they have received vast benefits in the past 3 or 4 years, and have received generosity from the Federal Government which they have not had before.

Mr. JAVITS. I differ with the Senator from Wisconsin on that point. I will lay side by side farm subsidies, feeder airline subsidies, and every other kind of subsidy, by population, for the 70 percent of Americans living in the big cities, and for the approximately 30 percent of Americans living in the small towns and rurals areas of America, and we will see something so topheavy that it will make our heads swim—and everyone knows that.

What are we talking about? We are talking about phasing out these subsidies. The phasing out period is outlined in detail on page 1019 of the hearings. The period would extend from 1965 to 1971, when the subsidy would disappear. That is it. At long last, as the Senator from Wisconsin said today, and by virtue of the fact that he has kept at it—for which I admire him—he has brought into being a program which is supported. This it it. This is the proposed end of it.

This phasing out of the program will give the operators their opportunity either to make it or not make it. At least, we wish them to get whatever profit they can out of the $46 million already invested by the Federal Government. In all frankness, that is the only reason I mentioned the other point. It is not a question of the Senator from Wisconsin bringing this point up, but because other Senators have raised the question who are always contending for farm subsidies or other kinds of subsidies, and they tell us how absolutely wasteful this helicopter program is. It is with respect to the general climate of that feeling that I was arguing in respect to the cities—nothing else.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Subsidies for urban renewal, for housing programs, and the poverty program, which I enthusiastically support, are subsidies which can be justified to help those who need to help themselves; but this helicopter subsidy is a subsidy for a service to persons who, on the basis of every study, need no help whatsoever. They are the affluent and well-to-do people of this Nation. Anyone who travels by helicopter, when he arrives at Kennedy Airport and wishes to go either to La Guardia or to Newark, will do so to save time and aid their convenience, spend $9 to save 30 minutes. Anyone who does that is likely to be a person with a substantial income, and not a person in Chicago or New York suffering, perhaps, from inadequate housing, inadequate education, and is in need of some assistance if he is going to get a fair break.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator well knows that many tourist passengers travel by helicopter, because they do not wish to spend 3 hours of their time driving through automobile traffic. It costs them only $9, and the increase in price to $12 would not be great. I hope that the Senator does not mean that the travel on airlines in this country is not confined to the affluent. If that be true, the airlines would soon be bankrupt. He knows that, from sitting next to passengers who travel just as he does. He knows that they are not all affluent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am basing my argument on the statistics I have seen on those who travel by helicopter and those who travel by airline. While some people have trouble affording it, they do travel by helicopter. For some it is difficult. But most of those who travel by helicopter, if they are to spend $9 to save half an hour, or spend more than that, to save even less time, are not the people who, by and large, need or deserve or want Government handouts.

The Senator from New York makes a very eloquent defense of his position, as he always does. After all, it is a New York subsidy. But I cannot see how other Senators from other parts of the country can support this kind of subsidy and say that they are against excessive Government spending. If they are for the subsidy, how can they oppose any Government spending? As the Senator from Georgia pointed out, this subsidy is by far the most inexcusable of all.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope that Senators are not going to support only those measures which will benefit their own particular areas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not accuse the Senator of doing that.

Mr. JAVITS. If they do that, not much will be done around here on any subject. This subsidy cannot be justified as a convenience to passengers. That argument was not raised by me, but it was raised by the Senator from Wisconsin. It has been justified entirely on its benefit to the country. That is the basis upon which I am sure the committee passed on it. The committee and the CAB, which supports the helicopter subsidy program, are more expert in this field than I, state that the subsidy is desirable and in the national interest. They state that it will promote the advance of transportation, that what has been invested has been justified, and that we should go forward with what we now have, to phase it out gradually and give it a full opportunity to perform. That is what I am basing my argument on. The affluence factor is background information. I do not happen to agree with the Senator from Wisconsin on that. It is not germane. The Senator may not agree with me on that, but I believe that it falls outside the argument. I do not believe that the United States can spend any money whatsoever, except for what is in the national interest. I am not for discriminating against the rich any more than I am for discriminating against the poor.

I have shed much blood on the floor of the Senate on both issues. All I can say is that the committee and the CAB have said categorically that this program was desirable in the interests of national transportation policy. We have sound reasons to argue for its continuance. That is the only argument I make.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The committee is divided on this question. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who is the outstanding expert on the Armed Services Committee in this country is in the best position in the Senate to judge whether this subsidy to commercial helicopters is of any value to the Air Force. He says that it is not. He says it is of no value whatsoever. More than that, he points out that the Air Force has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development on helicopters, all of which is available to the commercial helicopter companies.

If we must subsidize commercial helicopters for the benefit of the Air Force, the Army, which also uses helicopters, and the Navy, it seems to me on the basis of the best judgment in this body and the best experience we have in this body, that the operation does not stand up.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that military point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say that I did not say what the Senator stated. The Senator said it. I am not claiming this program as a laboratory for the Army, and neither is the committee. I am with the majority of the committee with respect to this point. I raised the point as one which the operators of helicopters had raised. I would like to add, however, that the CAB testified at page 1019 of the record of hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee that the improvement in helicopter transportation capacity has "made a direct and substantial contribution to the national defense."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was intrigued by what the distinguished Senator from New York had to say about the poor treatment that the big cities receive in the way of subsidies.

I remember two most recent acts voted by Congress giving subsidies to the big cities, the Mass Transportation Act, and the Open-Air Lands Act, both of which were enacted solely for the benefit of the feeder airlines. If the Senator from New York believes that none of the people who are traveling on feeder airlines are traveling in order to save time, he is completely mistaken. I should say that about the same proportion of people who travel from places like Gainesville, Fla., or Ocala, Fla., Tallahassee, Panama City, or other places are traveling to get on a trunkline to go to another part of the country. The feeder airlines are just as important when it comes to the great metropolitan areas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt at that point, the Senator is correct. Anyone who has flown from Chicago into Wisconsin knows that the feeder airlines go into Chicago from Wisconsin. They go into Los Angeles and New York. Probably the three biggest beneficiaries of the feeder subsidy are New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago. It helps all the big cities, particularly the big cities which are the centers of air traffic.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. When the time comes when Senators object to Federal appropriations because they go mostly to big cities, we should think about the welfare appropriations and others. We are talking about human beings instead of cities, villages, and small towns. We want to treat everyone alike.

We are not treating everyone alike in the matter of helicopter service. We do not have to go any farther away than this isolated area where helicopter service is so badly needed. A small, independent, and nonsubsidized service survives there in an effort to make easier the lot of people who try to transfer from one of the three great airports to the other, or vice versa.

The point is that this is something that was justified for a long time before the committee on the basis of being told:

> If you just go another year, we will get some new helicopters that will take more people, do it more rapidly, and do a better job, and we are satisfied that it will be self-sustaining.

They have now conveniently forgotten that argument. They have gotten their new helicopters. They are not self-sustaining. The yare not trying to expand their service. They are not trying to cut out the subsidy. They are trying to concentrate it in the three great centers. They will not be satisfied. This subsidy was granted in the House, but the operators want it raised in the Senate so that those three discriminatory helicopter services now maintained and subsidized by the U.S. Government may continue to service the public and be subsidized.

My own feeling is that it is as wrong as it can be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York said that the whole operation would be phased out in 5 years. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has indicated, we have been told year after year that the phaseout would be in 1 or 2 years.

The conference report in 1963 stated:

> The conferees agree that the subsidies for helicopters should be ended shortly—that this service should either be made self-supporting or concluded. It is recommended that the appropriate committees of the Congress give their earnest consideration to this problem in 1963.

We are told now in 1964, "Do not give us 1, 2, or 3 more years; we want 5 more years, and that will be the end of it."

We know that this will not be the end of it.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is in charge of the bill, has told us very frankly that in his view it ought to be extended. His answer is that there ought to be subsidies, not to 3 cities, but to 10 or 15 cities. There is a strong case for that argument. We should not deceive ourselves. They want the subsidy now. There is no question that it can be ended, or we can go on

indefinitely with the subsidy which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has called the most inexcusable subsidy that the Senate pays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be clear. We never promised, and no one ever promised, at any time that the subsidy would end in a given year. We expressed the hope that it would reach a final plateau when the operators obtained new equipment. We even went to the extent of examining their books. They conduct a rather tight operation. There are no big salaries or anything like that. Let that be understood.

While we have been dealing with the three cities—and their need for extended service has been great—on the other hand, in the Los Angeles area, eight new stations have been established. Some other factors were added in New York because of the planes going into Newark. So two factors have been involved.

We asked the Board to reexamine the situation. I want to put this point in the RECORD. I will not read all of the statement. This appears on page 59 of what we call our side slips in the Appropriations Committee. It reads:

This statement is presented in response to the request of Chairman MAGNUSON during consideration of the Board's 1965 budget justifications before this committee on April 15, 1964.

The Board is very frank and honest about this. I read part of this earlier. The Board states:

Pursuant to the foregoing, the Board has further considered and reevaluated its policy for subsidized helicopter services in the light of all currently known factors and developments, including particularly the repeated expressions of congressional intent and the limitations in the appropriations bills with regard to these services.

Through fiscal 1964, subsidy aggregating approximately $46 million has been paid to the helicopter carriers serving the Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York metropolitan areas. These payments have made it possible for the three carriers to progress from small non-passenger-carrying rotary-wing aircraft to twin-turbine 25-passenger helicopters (in the case of Los Angeles and New York), and 12-seat piston-powered aircraft (Chicago). They have thus made a direct and substantial contribution to the national defense, have convenienced the public as well as facilitated the mail service, and have otherwise made substantial contributions to the national interest. They should also prove helpful in connection with the supersonic aircraft program which may well involve service at airports located at points relatively remote from city centers.

The Board believes that these services—as a whole—can begin to break even without subsidy support sometime during fiscal 1969, and have reasonable prospect of being self-sufficient by the close of fiscal 1970. The Board is of the view that these services would require approximately $17.8 million in subsidy for the entire 6-year period from 1965 through 1970, as compared to the $46 million already invested therein.

The Board then gives us a list of what they thought year by year. They go on to arrive at their further conclusions. This was a statement made by the Board to the committee; and we asked for a complete reevaluation. I wanted it to be clear that the Board has been very frank with the committee. We have looked at the question frankly. I am having this statement printed in the RECORD so that we shall know what we are doing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is only saying that the estimate of the CAB is that they may be able to break even in 5 years, and that if they do not break even, apparently the subsidy will continue.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Board does not say that. The committee goes even further than the Board. We say that we believe there is some good valid justification. We say that the committee expects for the next fiscal year to completely examine the problem of subsidies for helicopter operation with a view to discontinuing them altogether, or determine if expanded operations are warranted. We do not say they are. This is our position.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the conference report in 1963 it was stated that they would be ended, shortly, concluded, and that Congress should start ending subsidies in 1963. But now it is said that they should be self-sustaining at the close of 1970, that the committee report should be studied, and that then we should decide whether we want to retain them, or expand them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If it is warranted, I think they should be expanded. I believe that helicopter services will be expanded all over the Nation in the next 10 years, as a part of every airline operation. Whether the operators are warranted in having a subsidy for this purpose, I do not know. It seems to me that if they become part of an airline operation, they might be phased into the operation. It should be a much better operation under the airlines. The local airlines still need this subsidy. They are contained in the bill. It sometimes seems that people think the committee wants to give the subsidies. The way some people talk, one would think we lie awake at night trying to figure out how to give away subsidies.

We are trying to provide what apparently the majority of the people desire. If we should cut out subsidies for local transport services in this country, every Senator would stand up and complain. So we are trying to continue the program as cheaply as possible. There is a strong desire for local transport service airlines. Senators and Representatives, as well as communities, keep after the CAB all the time to add new places for which airlines should provide new services. The airlines might have been off subsidies, but they are now serving 657 cities. If any Senator thinks that the people who pay the taxes in those cities would agree that those subsidies should be eliminated, I suggest that they be cut out for a couple of weeks and see what happens. Senators would beat a path to my door. They would say, "Let us reinstate this service. Let us put it in. We cannot stand this situation."

Airline subsidies are no different from other subsidies, whatever they are called. The Government has given every form of transportation this country has known a subsidy. The result has been that our transportation systems have been kept private. Railroads receive some subsidies; airlines get some; trucklines get some; the private citizens who travel the most get some. The inland waterways get some. Help for all kinds of transportation has made our country economically great.

If we had been backward in that field, we would not be as economically developed as we are. I venture to say that if a study were made of the subject, beginning back in the early days when even roads were subsidized, we would find that there has been turned back into the Treasury much more than the amount of taxes and other benefits that those subsidies have cost.

So let us not pick on the airlines when we ask them to serve communities at a loss. We tell them to furnish the service that at least the CAB and the community think they need, and it is not justifiable to pick on them because they are eligible for the subsidy.

I understand that helicopters come in a different category. We are trying to work out the problem the best we know how. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I do not like the situation. We have been studying the problem for 5 or 6 years. At our request, we received from the Civil Aeronautics Board a pretty solid report. The problem was presented to President Kennedy, and the CAB followed up the inquiry with the report, which I shall place in the RECORD in full. If we weigh all the angles both ways on the question, we shall find that there is pretty good justification for the request.

I do not know whether it would be economically feasible for local transport lines, or even trunklines, to have subsidized operations as a part of their business. They are growing bigger and better. They are becoming safer. As the Senator knows, they can land in difficult places. In New York the other day an experiment was conducted in which a helicopter landed on top of the Pan American Building.

In my hometown a man with one helicopter lands on top of a hotel and then goes out to the airport. They are furnishing the service. If it continues, people will request me to see that the service is continued. But the man is not yet making any money on the operation. The service will be necessary as an integral part of a whole system.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the committee should be picked on for providing a subsidy which is alleged to be unjustifiable in every aspect. I thoroughly agree that it is questionable. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I know what a problem it is. I know no place where present requests seem to fit in. I wish I had gotten in on the subsidy in the early days. Perhaps my State would have received it. But we are trying to continue the appropriation on the basis which the CAB recommends. In my view, after reading the report, the CAB apparently justifies the operation. We have been told that we could cut them all out if we wish to do so.

The Chairman of the Board said to us frankly that if we should take the House

figure, which was $3 million, and divide it arbitrarily, providing $1 million for each airport, it would not work that way. It is true that the Chicago operation is smaller than the New York and Los Angeles operations. But the Chairman said that we could not operate in that way because under the law and under their certificate they are entitled to this subsidy. We have estimated $4,300,000 for the item for the coming year. As I stated before, I think they would probably have a legal case in the Court of Claims. I believe that in the case of one airport, the certificate runs for 1 year; another airport, for 2½ years; and the other, for 3 years. They are obligated, and the CAB has pointed that out in the record. It is their estimate. It is not ours. We have been told that either we pay that money or we might as well cut out the service altogether. The certificate would be canceled and that would be the end of it.

In view of the importance of the subject, we did not believe that we should take such drastic action. It is about as simple as that, even though we did not particularly like all the things we must do in that field.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make one or two brief observations.

As always, the Senator from Washington is most persuasive. The operation to which we are referring happens to be the most exclusive club on earth in receiving subsidies, grants, gifts, and handouts from the Federal Treasury. This committee of the Congress has maintained the most exclusive club on earth.

I have offered an amendment in the committee for 2 years which would open up the service to one more airport, one more city. I have attempted to let some other group of people in the United States share in the benefit. The same people that are today fighting for the subsidy said, "No; you cannot extend it by one. You must not extend it. It must stay where it is. It must remain exclusive with the three cities that have had the teat in their mouths for all the 11 years milking the Federal tax money."

Mr. President, if the program is going to be continued, I suggest that if there is any city on earth that is entitled to participate in it it is Washington, D.C., where are located Dulles Airport, National Airport, and Friendship Airport.

Sometimes one airport is closed and a passenger must go to one of the others. If there is any place where helicopter service ought to be subsidized, it is in Washington. But the Board finds reasons and excuses for denying certificates for any other city. The majority of the committee has supported them in that position all the way down the line. They may deplore it, but they do not do anything about it. They resist every effort to get even one more city into this certification program to enjoy all the benefits.

There have been subsidies for transportation in this country. We have them today, to a certain extent, on our highways. But it is not a closed corporation. It is not a monopoly. We have it today, to a certain extent, for our airlines. But it constantly shifts from year to year. Cities go on and cities go off; lines go on and lines go off. But these three airports—Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York—go on and on forever, almost like Tennyson's brook.

Five or 6 years ago I tried to bring into the bill a provision which would permit the admission of one other airport to this exclusive field of three that have enjoyed a subsidy for 11 years, and it was resisted every inch of the way.

In my opinion, these airports ought to get along like the one in Seattle, Wash. The Senator said that some individual out there is trying to fly a helicopter. He is not making any money out of the operation, because he cannot get into the closed corporation and get a certificate. These three lines are no better than the individual in Seattle, Wash., or the operator in Washington, D.C., or the one in Atlanta, Ga., that are trying to make a living operating a helicopter service.

There cannot possibly be any excuse for continuing this exclusive club from year to year to year. The CAB can come here with a document full of a great many arguments that are based on facts as to which they alone are privy. They are the only ones who know anything about it, and any department that cannot make a good argument in support of its budget estimate should be run out of Washington, and would deserve to be. But the responsibility of the Congress should not cease with the argument of the Department and the acceptance of a justification or glorification of a subsidy payment. That is particularly true when the argument is worn as threadbare as this has been over the past several years, when the effort was made either to crack the monopoly and let someone else get in on it, or to say it has served its purpose.

I have no hope that the Senate will do anything about it. There seems to be some kind of hypnosis that attaches to this particular handout or subsidy, but it is my judgment it ought to be abolished altogether. Either it should be defeated or the poor devil who is trying to make a living in Seattle, Atlanta, Boston, or elsewhere should share a few dollars of that subsidy, instead of letting it go in big chunks to these three cities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not a fact that this is a service of convenience that saves only a few minutes, at considerable cost, which is often a deluxe service, as contrasted to the service granted by the feeder lines and trunk lines, which carry people a substantial distance and save long periods of time?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true, but there are helicopter services struggling along in places without a subsidy, when $2 million is spent in one city. The Los Angeles subsidy amounts to $2 million. But others are struggling, trying to get along, and do not get a nickel of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The purpose of my question was to point out that this was a subsidy for a service saving at most a few minutes, a deluxe service, as contrasted with services for long distance furnished by the feeder or trunk lines.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not disparage the service. There is no comparison with feeder lines, because they change from day to day or week to week, and add on or take off. But for 11 years these same cities have been drawing every dime of this money.

Mr. HOLLAND. The point I was making is that I do not think there is a necessity attached to this service for the public convenience and necessity, as compared with the feeder lines or trunklines. It is not a service of necessity. It saves only a few minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to our distinguished and dear friend from Georgia, "chairman of the Board of Directors" of the Senate Establishment, express his sorrow over the alleged fact that this group of helicopter carriers is an exclusive club. But this is not any club at all. The fact is that these three carriers—who serve in New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago—share in this subsidy because the CAB has determined that the services are required in the national interest and to meet public convenience and necessity. I am sure that, with the great persuasive powers our friend from Georgia has, if his suggested application for services in other cities had merit, it would be favorably acted upon by the CAB.

The committee has recommended that this subsidy be granted for this year and that this whole matter be thoroughly studied thereafter. It has pledged itself to a thorough examination of the helicopter subsidy for the next fiscal year. I think that is commendable.

I do not want to fall into the unfortunate position of attacking other subsidies when I urge this one. There are many subsidies which I have opposed, but many which I have voted for, under certain circumstances, which were not of direct benefit to the State of New York. But here is one in which we are deeply interested, and which is essential to the operation of a very busy area of the country, the same as Chicago and Los Angeles.

The helicopter service known as New York Airways has made real and substantial progress in this area. It has increased its passenger revenue miles from 2.3 million in 1959 to 4.7 million in 1963, more than doubling of service benefits over just a 4-year period. The Federal payments have been decreased from 67.3 percent of the total operating revenues in 1959 to 46.6 percent in 1963. Hopefully, that trend will continue.

But to cut the subsidy off completely would be an extremely drastic move which would have grave repercussions so far as New York Airways is concerned, and I suspect, the others. I intend to support the committee. I do not intend to throw away the results of this experiment, and I do not intend to consign these three carriers to the business of selling surplus used aircraft. I will vote against the amendment.

Further, our friend from Wisconsin is known as a humane, friendly, personable Member of this body. I think, on the very day we are swearing in our new distinguished colleague, that to try to cut off these funds for the State of California—and I never expected to find myself here pleading for California—would seem like a discourtesy to our new colleague who has just joined us here, after a vote pretty strictly along party lines. But regardless of party, all of us have cordially welcomed him. We have all known him for some time. We like him whether we may be for or against him politically.

I plead with my colleague from Wisconsin not to throw down the gauntlet to our new friend and colleague from California. It does not seem the way to treat him on his first day. At least, put over the amendment until tomorrow, because our colleague is entitled to at least that much consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to join in this very fine welcome to Senator SALINGER, and by his mere presence I hope he will have won his first battle in the Senate.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. As a Republican, I think it is unfortunate, of course, that our colleague has been given such a timely chance to cast his first vote on a measure that means so much to the State of California. This may be just a plot on the part of our colleague from Wisconsin in order to give our colleague from California an opportunity to vote against an amendment that is bad for California, but knowing the Senator from Wisconsin the way I do, I could not bring myself to think he would be a party to anything of that kind.

Even though the yeas and nays have been ordered, I would not object for a moment if the Senator felt it appropriate to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the order for the yeas and nays, not only as a wonderful courtesy to our friend from California, but also in recognition of where the merits lie.

Let me reiterate that I want to get rid of subsidies as much as anybody else. But the subsidies in this case have been going down. The nonsubsidy revenues have been going up. I think the situation will eventually right itself, but it would be a devastating blow to have the subsidy knocked out all in 1 year. Let the committee carefully study the whole question next year. I have no doubt its study will be effective, and although I am not so foolhardy as to believe a perfect solution can be reached, I hope the committee will arrive at some of the answers.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I say with great respect to my friend from Wisconsin that his amendment is a vicious amendment and it ought to be defeated, and defeated overwhelmingly.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not yield at this time. Why did the Civil Aeronautics Board proceed to enter into an agreement with three private helicopter operators under which the Federal Government subsidizes a portion of their operations? They did it in accordance with the mandate of Congress in the form of a statute. That statute is still on the books. The Board has authorized private helicopter operations in three great municipalities. Senators can denounce them if they wish, but they represent a valid Federal obligation and are, indeed, a wave of the future. I see the Senator from Ohio smiling. I say that his cities will need some kind of transportation, too, to overcome the congestion in the expanding municipal areas of his State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, but——

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not yield at this time. Under the statute the Civil Aeronautics Board has given certificates to three private groups. Why did it do that? It did so because it believed, acting under law, that the public interest would be served by developing the feasibility of a new kind of airborne transportation in heavily populated areas where automobile congestion plagues the people. It did it also because it believed—and it was so advised by the Department of Defense—that there was a military interest in developing this kind of transportation.

I have before me a map of metropolitan Los Angeles, which is served by the Los Angeles Airways Helicopter System. It is an excellent system serving a great community. The Presiding Officer knows this area. He knows how long it takes to drive an automobile from Los Angeles International Airport to San Bernardino. It takes hours. It is a heavily congested area. Do Senators know how long it takes to go by helicopter? It takes 32 minutes.

My home is at Anaheim. When people ask me where I live I say I live at Anaheim, and then ask me "Where is that?" I say that is where Disneyland is located. Do Senators know how long it takes to drive from Anaheim to Los Angeles International Airport? It takes over an hour. It is possible to go there by helicopter in 16 minutes.

This helicopter service in urban areas constitutes a real possibility that ought to be developed with the aid of our Federal Government as the law provides. We should not shove this program down the drain. We should consent to continue this appropriation, to give these three separate private concerns an additional opportunity to prove the economic value of this new kind of transportation.

The reason for this operation is to have a demonstration proof that the people of the United States, as they cluster together in large open areas of the country, may have an opportunity to use a unique type of service for transportation from one point to another and, having had that opportunity, may be able to utilize it in every State of the land.

I hope the amendment will be soundly defeated.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the diligent Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. It is important, in this body, that we speak not as Senators from a particular State, although that is our primary interest in matters of this type. We must disregard any provincialism and think in terms of the development of a system of transport in the United States which will serve our mobile mass population.

In the State of West Virginia, we are served by six scheduled air carriers. These airlines fall into two categories. There are three trunkline carriers, American, Eastern, and United, which receive no subsidies. The local service operators are Allegheny, Lake Central, and Piedmont, which do have the help of subsidy payments. They are doing a needed job for our people.

As my esteemed colleague from Wisconsin knows, these local service carriers receive a form of subsidy, not only in my State but also in the instance of North Central Airlines, in serving Wisconsin communities to the number of more than 15. It is important that we continue in West Virginia, a State of mountainous terrain, the local service carriers in scheduled daily operation. We are a part of the interstate air transport system. Very frankly, we need air transportation in communities like Morgantown, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Elkins, Beckley, Bluefield, Martinsburg, Wheeling, Huntington, Charleston, and the surrounding area. The distances are long in travel time even though they may not be long in actual over-the-road mileage. We need air transportation developed to a maximum.

I believe it appropriate for me to document the RECORD to indicate my interest, as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, in bringing to the attention of Congress the need to develop the air mail pickup system in the United States.

In the mountain areas of West Virginia and in nearby States, including Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, New York, and Delaware, the airmail pickup system was pioneered. Light planes operated at regular intervals between numerous outlying communities, and by means of a unique pickup system were able to take on and discharge mail without landing. The aircraft were equipped with a grappling hook designed to enable the pilot to snatch the waiting mail pouches as they hung suspended between twin poles. At the same time, the mail being delivered was dropped to waiting attendants.

The success of this system was so widely accepted that applications for service at one time totaled 22,000 route miles to serve 13,000 communities in 29 States. On many occasions routine pickups were made when unfavorable weather conditions would have prevented the aircraft from landing. Severe snow storms and

flood conditions were successfully overcome, and the mail was sped toward its destination without delay.

During World War II several useful adaptations to the airmail pickup system were devised. Grounded gliders were taken in tow by planes which were already airborne, thus giving our armed forces a new capability for swift mobility and flexible action. Individual personnel equipped with a special shock-absorbing harness were also snatched from the ground by low-flying planes, and gradually drawn up into the aircraft itself. This method was proven effective in evacuating wounded personnel from isolated combat areas under conditions of extreme emergency.

Positive benefit accrued to the people of the United States because of the development of the airmail pickup system—a system which was brought to fruition through experimentation and subsidy. This was done because Congress believed that such a program should go forward.

Naturally I feel there is a reluctance here to continue to subsidize the helicopter service in question because it is lodged in three large cities or metropolitan areas of the United States. I can well understand the desire to spread the benefits of the helicopter service. There should be no monopoly, and in this argument I agree with the astute Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

However, I wish to remind Senators that the President of the United States is a constant user of helicopters as was the late President Kennedy. I also remind Senators that new uses for the helicopters are being developed not only in commercial transportation but also in the military phase of this type of flight. Further, this service is being provided where it is most needed—in and around three of our large centers of population.

The committee is sound in its position, and after very careful study, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MAGUNSON. The Senator from West Virginia has long been an ardent leader and supporter of aviation, both as a Member of Congress and when he was not in Congress.

When we speak about the lack of subsidies, we should consider the progress of the trunklines. It was necessary to subsidize them, and subsidize them heavily in some cases, much more than is proposed in this instance. In earlier days, we were engaged in developing aviation in the United States so that we might have the greatest commercial air transportation in the world. We now have it. But it was many years before the commercial airlines were able to operate without a subsidy. They had to become more efficient, to determine their routes, and to provide service for more people. They accomplished all those things as they expanded.

The whole question is whether we want to assist aviation to make progress. There are times when we should blow the whistle and stop; I understand that. But it was necessary to subsidize the airlines in the earlier days.

I look forward to the day, I hope not too far distant, when the local air transport services will be able to operate without subsidies. Nevertheless, I remember when the so-called trunklines were more heavily subsidized than are the helicopter services today, in order to enable them to get started. As a result, the United States today has the best airlines system in the world.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Washington. I remember when American Airlines, now one of the three or four largest scheduled air carriers in the world, was a fledgling. I recall when, in the 1930's, C. R. Smith came to me and spoke about the desire of his company to cross the State of West Virginia on its route from Cincinnati to Washington, D.C. I well remember when that small airline, a carrier that received a subsidy in its developmental period, came to West Virginia and provided air service at Charleston, Parkersburg, Clarksburg, and Elkins.

Today, C. R. Smith is chairman of the board of American Airlines, and is recognized as one of the truly constructive leaders in the development of our commercial air transport system. Under his capable guidance that company has prospered, and has expanded its service to include a much larger portion of our population.

American Airlines now serves our State only at the capital city, Charleston, through the Kanawha County Airport. The carrier removed itself from the other cities by an understanding or an agreement with the citizens of the community as well as with the Federal Government. Local service carrier would replace it and be able to provide an improved flight pattern, with additional flights, and more available seats. Subsidy in cases such as this has proven to be a wise investment in the future of our Nation.

The Senator from Washington speaks the truth. In periods of development, we must not throttle or stifle any phase of aircraft experimentation and use. Let us be Senators of vision and reality in the changing scope of air transportation.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, today is the first anniversary of the signing of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, one of the notable events in contemporary world history.

Both in symbol and in substance the test ban treaty has proven to be a significant event in the trend of relations between the Soviet Union and the West. It marked a decision by both sides, albeit a tentative and even an uncertain decision, to take control of the haphazard tendencies of the cold war and to seek to guide the relations of the great nuclear powers toward peace and limited accommodation.

The significance of the test ban treaty is not that it has ended the rivalry between the Soviet Union and the free world, but that it represents a tentative agreement by both sides to conduct that rivalry by means less likely to lead to catastrophe than the competition in uncontrolled nuclear testing. The treaty further represents an acknowledgment by both sides that the conflict between them on a wide variety of issues is overriden by the common interest which they share with all other nations in the prevention of nuclear war.

It is, of course, possible that the limited agreements in various fields which have been concluded with the Soviet Union will be overturned, but it is worth noting that thus far these modest accommodations have been honored. There has been no breach of the test ban treaty in the past year, nor has there been any violation of the Antarctic Treaty in the 5 years since it was concluded for the purpose of excluding the cold war from the Antarctic Continent.

We are entitled on this first anniversary of the nuclear test ban treaty to take pride in the progress which has been achieved toward a more peaceful world order. We are further entitled to feel cautious optimism in the prospects for further limited accommodations which will result in the strengthening of the foundations of world peace.

A new psychological relationship between the Soviet Union and the West has been slowly and painfully evolving over the last few years. It is a relationship in which each has come to regard the behavior of the other as reasonably predictable, a relationship in which it has become possible for us to anticipate prudent if not benevolent behavior on the part of the Soviet leadership. It is to be hoped that this evolving tendency toward peace, symbolized by the limited nuclear test ban treaty, will continue to evolve until 1 day the great nations of the world are related to each other not merely by bonds of predictability but by bonds of confidence and friendship.

SECURITIES LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in July of last year, the Senate passed S. 1642, a bill framed by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and introduced by me, by request, to amend the Securities Acts, relating to securities traded in the over-the-counter market and to qualification requirements and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers. In passing that bill today, the House amended the provision relating to stock insurance companies, and made other relatively minor changes.

I have discussed the House changes in the Senate bill with Hon. William L. Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and with the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Douglas Dillon. Both are of the opinion that the importance of completing action on the major features of this bill before adjournment outweighs the differences that might honestly exist concerning the relative merits of the Senate and the House versions.

In view of the fact that tomorrow I shall move that S. 1642 be taken from the desk and that the Senate agree to the House amendments without a con-

ference, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter to me, dated August 5, from Hon. William L. Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in which he recommends that the Senate accept S. 1642 as amended by the House.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1964.

Re S. 1642.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: The purpose of this letter is to respond to your letter of August 5, 1964, requesting our views with respect to the changes in S. 1642 which were made by the House of Representatives. We will refer to the bill in the form it passed the Senate as the Senate bill, and to the form in which it passed the House as the House bill.

As you know, the bill has two primary purposes: First, to extend the disclosure and other requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to larger issuers whose securities are traded in the over-the-counter market; and, second, to provide improved qualification requirements and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers.

In the first area, that of disclosure by issuers, the House committee made two changes which we regard as significant. The first involves the treatment of foreign securities under the bill, and the second relates to the securities of insurance companies. With respect to qualifications and disciplinary proceedings, the significant changes made by the House involve the requirement of compulsory membership in a national securities association, and the registration of broker-dealers whose business is exclusively intrastate.

I. FOREIGN SECURITIES

With respect to foreign securities, section 3(c)(2) of the Senate bill exempted them from the requirements of the bill unless the Commission withdrew the exemption as to any class of issuers upon the basis of a finding that continued exemption is not in the public interest or consistent with the protection of investors. The House bill subjects foreign securities to the bill but authorizes the Commission to exempt any such securities if it finds that such exemption is in the public interest and is consistent with the protection of investors. Section 3(d) of both bills in addition grants to the Commission broad powers to exempt issuers or classes of issuers from any provisions of the bill.

In its report with respect to this change the House committee explained that its amendment simply reverses this exemption procedurally and that the Commission will have broad authority to deal flexibly with the problem. The committee further specifically pointed out that failure of a foreign issuer to comply with the provisions of the bill will not of itself mean that trading in the United States in the securities of such issuer will be illegal or for that reason give rise to civil liabilities on broker-dealers trading in the securities.

The Commission believes that in the light of the House committee report and the procedures available to it, it can work out any problems involving foreign issuers in a manner that will take into account the harm that could result to investors from the disruption of the trading markets, that will reflect the particular problems of foreign issuers, and that will provide significant benefits to American investors. As the House committee pointed out, the differences in the two bills are procedural. Under either approach, the substantive problems are the same and the determination of ultimate coverage is largely in the discretion of the Commission.

The House committee report makes it clear that the House bill provides the Commission with sufficiently broad authority to exempt any foreign security for which it would have allowed the initial exemption under the Senate bill to remain unrevoked.

If the approach to the House bill is adopted, the Commission will exempt all foreign securities for a period of at least 1 year. This temporary exemption would give the Commission time for further studies of foreign securities generally and to consider any problem with respect to any individual security or class or classes of securities. During the period of the temporary exemption, any foreign company, group of companies, or any interested person, such as a broker-dealer, could request that the temporary feature of the exemption be removed and present reasons why this should be done. The Commission would make appropriate findings and issue orders or adopt rules removing the temporary feature with respect to specific foreign companies or classes thereof. Thus, no foreign security would be covered until its issuer and other interested persons are given an opportunity to present their views. We believe that this approach to the foreign security problem is acceptable to the House, as indicated by the House report and by the discussion on the floor during the debate on the House bill.

In short, although we testified in favor of the approach in the Senate bill the Commission views the foreign securities provision in the House bill, especially when read in conjunction with the House report, as providing a reasonable and workable basis for dealing with the foreign securities problem.

II. INSURANCE COMPANIES

The Senate bill subjected the securities of insurance companies to the disclosure and other requirements in the same manner as the securities of other companies. The House bill exempts securities issued by insurance companies if all of three specified conditions are met. In substance these are that the insurance company file annual reports with the commissioner of insurance of its domiciliary State which conform to those prescribed by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; that such insurance company be subject to regulation of proxy solicitation by its domiciliary State which conforms to that prescribed by such association; and that, after July 1, 1966, trading by officers, directors, and larger security holders of such company be subject to regulation by its domiciliary State substantially in the manner provided in section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

We understand that this change is the outgrowth of representations made to the House committee by State insurance commissioners to the effect that they would provide the necessary regulation in these areas and they believed that such regulation should be left to the States rather then undertaken by the Federal Government.

The Commission opposed this amendment before the House committee primarily upon the ground that the securities of insurance companies constitute an important segment of the over-the-counter market and there seemed no adequate basis for depriving investors in the securities of insurance companies of the same scheme of protection which is to be provided for the securities of other classes of companies.

The House committee, however, preferred to give the State insurance commissioners an opportunity to provide the necessary protection. If they are able and willing to do so, the objectives of the bill as to insurance companies will thereby be accomplished. If, in the light of experience, it should appear that adequate protection is not being provided through the medium of State regulation, as provided for in the House bill, the Congress can reconsider the question. The House bill, however, holds promise of achieving a workable approach to this problem.

III. COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN REGISTERED SECURITIES ASSOCIATIONS

Section 6(a) of the Senate bill amended section 15(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require all registered brokers and dealers to be members of a registered national securities association. This was done because under section 7(a) of that bill the establishment of qualifications for entry into the securities business was to be accomplished through the medium of requirements by such associations, and also because the general scheme of the Securities Exchange Act and of the bills relies heavily upon self-regulation as a means of requiring adherence by brokers and dealers to appropriate standards of conduct and subjecting them to necessary disciplinary controls.

The House bill eliminates the requirement of membership in such associations. In lieu thereof that bill grants to the Commission, under three new paragraphs to be added at the end of section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act, power to prescribe qualifications for brokers and dealers who are not members of an association and for persons associated with such brokers and dealers, and additional rulemaking and regulatory authority over such nonmember brokers and dealers which is designed to be substantially equivalent to the authority which such associations have over their members. These provisions also require such nonmember brokers and dealers to pay to the Commission fees which are designed to defray the additional costs to be incurred by the Commission in prescribing qualifications, giving examinations, and performing the additional regulatory duties required of it with respect to such nonmember brokers and dealers. We understand that this change was made by the House committee in response to the request of certain broker-dealers, particularly certain large distributors of investment company shares who maintain their own sales forces and who are not presently members of such an association. These broker-dealers represented to the House committee that they strongly perferred to be regulated directly by the Commission rather than by associations whose members would include their competitors.

In testimony before the House committee the Commission opposed this change, primarily in deference to the achievements of self-regulation in the securities industry in raising and maintaining standards of conduct—in many cases above those required by law—and also because it believed that an extension of the existing framework of self-regulation was preferable to more intensive direct Government regulation of these particular brokers and dealers. On the other hand, we believe that the additional powers granted to us under the House bill will enable us to provide, as to these nonmember broker-dealers, standards and requirements comparable to those which will be established by national securities associations, and that we will thus be able to accomplish as to these brokers and dealers the essential objectives of the bill.

IV. EXCLUSIVELY INTRASTATE BROKERS AND DEALERS

The Senate bill would have repealed the existing exemption from the broker-dealer registration requirements of the Securities Exchange Act which is available to brokers and dealers whose business is exclusively intrastate. The House bill restored this exemption.

Oregon stated his position on the merits of the issue, which resulted in the unanimous vote of that convention in support of the position of the two Senators from Oregon. That was also long before July 29. At the beginning of this year this controversy started. There has been a consistent record on the part of the two Senators from Oregon.

Mr. President, the fact that we have disagreed with the Secretary of the Interior and his Bonneville Administrator, Mr. Luce, is no indication that we did not cooperate with them.

To the contrary, we presented our disagreements in the form of pleas for cooperation, rather than controversy, and finally ended with a final agreement of which we approve.

On July 27, Mr. Udall sent to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and Representative MAHON a letter setting forth their last proposal which became an acceptable one for the intertie. It is this proposal to which Mr. Udall refers in his press release of July 29, that I shall come to in a moment. At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to Senator HAYDEN and Mr. MAHON dated July 27, 1964.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1964.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN and GEORGE MAHON,
Chairmen, Appropriations Committees, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN and MR. MAHON: As a result of conferences between Senators and Congressmen from Western States interested in the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, we have been asked two questions:

1. Could our report of June 24, 1964, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, as amended July 21, 1964, be further amended to include an all-Federal tie between the Federal Columbia River power system and the Federal Central Valley project power system?

2. If so, what plan of service would accomplish this objective most economically?

The answer to the first question is yes, and this letter may be regarded as such a further amendment. Our report to the Appropriations Committees dated June 24, 1964, is based upon our understanding of the criteria that Congress asked us to apply in negotiations with non-Federal entities for construction of the intertie lines, see conference committee report accompanying H.R. 9140, House Report No. 1027, December 11, 1963. If it is now determined, as a matter of policy, that the intertie program include an all-Federal tie between the Columbia and the Central Valley, our report can be amended accordingly.

The answer to the second question is that an all-Federal tie between the Columbia and Central Valley systems can be accomplished most economically if the Bureau of Reclamation constructs a 500-kilovolt line from the California-Oregon boundary into Round Mountain station about 100 miles south of the State boundary; and from Round Mountain, a 230-kilovolt line to Cottonwood station, where it would connect, directly and indirectly, with five existing Federal 230-kilovolt lines now carrying Shasta and Trinity power southward to Tracy. Such a line would be an extension into northern California of the Bonneville 500-kilovolt line proposed for construction from John Day Dam to the California-Oregon boundary. The approximate cost to the Bureau of Reclamation of such lines, including substation additions, is $20,300,000. To start construction of such lines in fiscal year 1965, the Bureau would require an additional appropriation of $500,000.

The modification of our intertie report to include construction of a Federal 500-kilovolt line from the California-Oregon line to Round Mountain, and a 230-kilovolt extension into Cottonwood, requires negotiation of certain additional agreements with other utilities whose facilities would be affected, for example:

1. P.G. & E.'s agreement would be needed to interconnect the Bureau's 500- and 230-kilovolt lines at P.G. & E.'s Round Mountain station, and the Bureau's 230-kilovolt line at its Cottonwood station.

2. A long-term agreement with P.G. & E. whereby the Bureau's 500- and 230-kilovolt lines would be operated in parallel with the company's 500-kilovolt lines, and system and capacities on the Bureau and company lines between the Oregon boundary and Tracy would be pooled. The capacity of the 500-kilovolt transmission line to be constructed by the Bureau from the Oregon border to Round Mountain shall be made available, first, for the Bureau's own uses up to 400 megawatts and the balance of the capacity in said line shall be made available to carry out the proposal of the companies including the fulfillment of obligations of the companies thereunder.

3. Agreement between the Bureau and the California companies for equitably sharing the wheeling revenues payable by the State and SMUD, and for reducing the companies' wheeling charges to the Bureau for service to Tracy. It may be necessary to adjust the charge to the State and SMUD, depending upon the result of further negotiations.

4. Agreement by the Pacific Power & Light Co. and the Portland General Electric Co. regarding their participation in the intertie plan.

5. Agreement by the California companies not to withdraw the other features of their proposal, including support for The Dalles-Los Angeles 750-kilovolt, direct-current line, and service to SMUD and the State of California.

In connection with our recommendation to Congress that either the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power or the Southern California Edison Co. construct the direct current tie between the Hoover and Sylmar direct-current terminals, further negotiations will also be necessary.

We cannot say at this time whether all of these agreements could be obtained on satisfactory terms if the intertie plan were thus amended. If funds are appropriated for such a line, we will use our best efforts to obtain the agreements.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the program outlined in that letter, which was the Department's last proposal, is quite different from the earlier proposals which, over the months, my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and I opposed.

A press release was issued by the Department of the Interior from the Office of the Secretary July 29, 1964, entitled "Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie Program OK'd by Federal, State, and Private Parties."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be inserted at this point in the RECORD, without my reading it.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST-PACIFIC SOUTHWEST INTERTIE PROGRAM OK'D BY FEDERAL, STATE, AND PRIVATE PARTIES

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today announced that all parties—private, municipal, State, and Federal—have reached agreement on a plan for construction and use of the biggest single electric transmission program ever conceived in the United States—the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie.

He said the Bureau of the Budget today sent to the Congress a request for $45.5 million to start construction this year of the Federal portions of three of the four lines, including both direct-current lines.

This program's provision for direct-current transmission is a history-making step that will put the United States in the forefront in world electric transmission technology.

The four lines extending from the Columbia River in the State of Washington to Hoover Dam on the Colorado and to Los Angeles and other points in California will carry more than 4 million kilowatts of power.

This is equivalent to the output of two Grand Coulee dams or equal to the daily power needs of six San Francisco's, or five Washington, D.C.'s.

These four lines will tie together electric systems—public and private—extending from Seattle to Los Angeles and Phoenix and will integrate the biggest hydro system in America (the Bonneville Power Administration), the biggest municipal system (the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power), and the largest single private system in the United States (the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.).

They will provide benefits to consumers in 11 Western States, including the customers of 248 rural electric cooperatives and municipal ssytems and other public agencies.

They will help provide a market for Canadian treaty power in the early years when it will be surplus to Northwest needs.

They will end the waste of kilowatts in the Pacific Northwest, save exhaustible fuels in the Southwest, and promote maximum electrical efficiency. This is conservation in action.

Two of these lines will be direct current transmission, including the one all-Federal line from the Dalles Dam between Washington and Oregon to Hoover Dam.

This is a top example of public and private utilities and State and Federal Government cooperation. It has two principal virtues: It reflects the diversity of ownership of electrical facilities in this country. And it provides built-in protection against monopoly.

The total investment will be approximately $700 million with the Federal Government's share about $300 million. The benefits are boundless.

Secretary Udall said the agreement as reached today calls for the Federal Government to build an additional 134 miles of line in northern California, directly linking the Federal Columbia River power system with the Fedearl Central Valley project in California.

He said the amended intertie plan had been agreed to by Governor Brown of California, the California congressional delegation, the California private utilities, and other key persons.

"We believe our amended plan will now be approved by Congress and funds appropriated this year to start construction of the Federal portions," Udall said.

As originally proposed to Congress, the California private utilities would have built all of the intertie facilities in northern California. Now the Bureau of Reclamation will build a 101-mile leg of one 500,000-volt alternating current line from the Oregon bor-

der to Round Mountain, Calif., and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will construct the remainder of this line to points south. The Bureau also will build a 33-mile tap at 230,000 volts from Round Mountain to its Cottonwood substation.

It will increase the Federal Government's investment in the intertie by approximately $20 million—from about $280 million to about $300 million, Secretary Udall said.

The full intertie package consists of four major lines from the Columbia River to southwest points and three shorter interconnecting lines.

Two of the big lines will transmit direct current at 750,000 volts—the world's longest direct-current lines. One will be all Federal, extending 830 miles from the Dalles Dam on the Columbia River to Hoover Dam on the Colorado River. The other will be built jointly by the Government and the city of Los Angeles 827 miles from The Dalles to Los Angeles.

The southern ends of the two direct-current lines will be tied together by a shorter 750,000-volt direct-current line in the future and will be built either by the city of Los Angeles or the Southern California Edison Co.

Two 345,000-volt lines also will be built from Hoover Dam to Phoenix, one by the Bureau of Reclamation and the other by the Arizona Public Service Co.

The other two major lines will be 500,000-volt alternating-current lines from the Columbia River to the vicinity of Los Angeles, serving northern and central California points on the way. These lines will be built jointly by the Federal Government and the private utilities.

Secretary Udall warmly praised all participants in the final round of negotiations which led to the revised plan. He specifically named Senators HAYDEN, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, BIBLE, and KUCHEL; Congressmen HOLIFIELD, SISK, MOSS, MCFALL, and JOHNSON.

"Congressman HOLIFIELD served as chairman for the final series of meetings," Secretary Udall said, "and he deserves an extra measure of credit for helping reconcile many different points of view."

Secretary Udall also complimented representatives of the California private utilities for "their cooperation and constructive suggestions." He added:

"With this kind of cooperative spirit between public and private power we will move forward together to give the American people the full benefits of electrical integration and maximum efficiency."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Udall is a better politician than this press release would seem to indicate. Giving him the benefit of every charitable doubt, he obviously did not check the press release very carefully before it went out, because I refuse to believe that he purposely and intentionally designed the press release to do injury to the two Senators from Oregon.

I am making this speech tonight in part to attempt to offset that injury and to put the record straight. In one paragraph in the press release he states:

Secretary Udall warmly praised all participants in the final round of negotiations which led to the revised plan. He specifically named Senators HAYDEN, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, BIBLE, and KUCHEL; Congressmen HOLIFIELD, SISK, MOSS, MCFALL, and JOHNSON.

He may say—and it would be factual—that the individuals he named hold positions on Senate and House committees; but he knows that the negotiations and conferences involve representatives far in excess of the number of members of committees. And he is a good enough politician to know that when that press release hits the newspapers in Oregon it will be used by detractors to seek to get across the false charge, "We told you so. The Senator from Oregon had nothing to do with it. Udall in effect says so. He does not even mention them as parties to the negotiations."

Secretary Udall can be called by the two Senators from Oregon as their witness of the extent to which he found himself involved, and his assistants, Mr. Luce and Mr. Holum, found themselves involved, in the negotiations with the two Senators from Oregon.

Of course, if he wanted to say, "There would not have been the agreement that I am now announcing today if the two Senators from Oregon had not opposed my previous agreement," he would be correct.

When the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] saw that paragraph, he said, "That is inexcusable. There is no justification for his issuing such a release."

I make the statement not only for self-interest alone, although self-interest is involved. I shall always defend myself from this kind of public relations on the part of bureaucrats. But I make the point also because the people of my State are entitled to know that the two Senators from Oregon contributed a great deal to the development of the final agreement.

Mr. Udall needs to refresh his memory on the politics he has forgotten, or the politics he obviously forgot about when he issued that press release, because any politician, any government official, would know that putting out such a release as that would be interpreted by the detractors of the two Senators from Oregon as evidence that the two Senators from Oregon were not parties to the weeks of negotiation and conference that led up to the final agreement.

I have made this speech in order to put the record straight, and I close with the suggestion that, in my judgment, Secretary Udall needs a refresher course in proper public relations with Congress.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that I may retain the floor at the conclusion of the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT BY SENATOR BEALL IN SOUTHEAST ASIA CRISIS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I wish to assure the President of my wholehearted support in this southeast Asia crisis.

Since the early days of our Republic, this country has advocated and fought for the principle of freedom of the seas. For 2 days in succession U.S. ships have been deliberately attacked by North Vietnamese PT boats. This long-established international principle has been deliberately violated. The President's first response was a blunt warning that grave consequences would follow if such an incident were repeated. Unheeding such warning, unconvinced of U.S. determination, the unprovoked attack was repeated. The President this time responded by ordering our military to attack the "nests" of the aggressor. This restrained retaliation should convey to the attackers that our words can be backed with action if needed.

I hope and pray that this message will be received.

Defense Department officials and the Nation are attempting to discover the motivations for these attacks. Further speculation on my part would be of no value. If, however, any foe is so naive as to construe the differences that exist during this election year as indicative of disunity and as an open invitation to further aggressive actions, let me say to such foes that nothing is further from the truth. They just have not read American history; they fail to understand American politics. For although Americans register their preferences for a political philosophy, this in no way affects the fact that our first loyalty remains to our Nation. For despite differences from within, when our Nation is challenged from without, we close ranks and unite. Senator GOLDWATER's instant endorsement of the President's policy exemplifies our unity. I salute his position, and the Nation should, also.

Mr. President, I am cognizant that national security frequently requires the withholding of information from the American public. Nevertheless I would hope, as much as national security permits, that the administration would fully disclose all information relating to this situation to the American public. For, given the facts, the American people can face any crisis, bear any burden, and pay any price to repel aggression. I urge all Americans, regardless of party, to unite behind our President.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I renew my previous unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what was the Senator's request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). That there be a call for a quorum, without the Senator from Colorado losing his right to the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, before the call for a quorum is begun, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Colorado withhold his unanimous-consent request for a quorum call in order to allow the Senator from Ohio to speak?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I know that the Presiding Officer cannot help in the solution of this problem; but if he could get the helicopters that have been flying around the Chamber for 3 hours out of the Chamber, and get a vote on the amendment, we would be making some progress toward having the Senate adjourn sine die by August 22.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Colorado for a moment?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Oregon has it.

Mr. MORSE. Before the quorum call and before the Senator from Colorado proceeds with the bill, would he have any objection to my making a speech now, a speech that the majority leader understood I was to make this afternoon?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure that I would be delighted to listen to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, although I have no idea of the number of hours he proposes to speak.

It would be my hope that since I have been sitting in the Chamber since 11 o'clock, with the hope that I might add a few words of what I hope to be wisdom to the subject under discussion, I could do so for a period of a few minutes and we could then have a vote, at least on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a great deal of office work unfinished, about which I am very much concerned. My speech is 16¼ pages long. I would guess it would take about 45 minutes or so to deliver, which is an exceedingly short speech for me.

Aside from this facetiousness, I have cooperated today with the majority leadership, but I did not believe that I could wait indefinitely to present opposing views to those expressed by the President of the United States when he appeared on television last night.

With all the propaganda afloat in the country today, those of us who do not share the President's views should have an opportunity to present our case in opposition.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Chair whether I have the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado does have the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder whether it would be agreeable to all Senators interested in this measure to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the present amendment in 15 minutes, at 4:15, with the understanding that thereafter the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would be given his right to the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I would be delighted to accede. I have always been cooperative in these matters.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree to that, provided——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado make his unanimous-consent request now?

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am going to exercise my prerogative, at long last, of having the floor, and I wish to make a unanimous-consent request, that there be a short quorum call, and that when that is concluded the time on the amendment be limited to 15 minutes, with 7½ minutes to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and 7½ minutes to be controlled by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. The unanimous-consent agreement is made with the understanding that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will thereafter obtain the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was hoping that the quorum call would bring in a few Senators who would like to hear and participate in discussion. We do not seem to have had too much luck, but I do wish to set the record straight about the helicopter program.

The helicopter program was instituted in the first instance to find out if it was possible to have an economically feasible commercial helicopter operation in this country.

Congress adopted it on this basis. It did not adopt it on any other basis. When the program began, the only vehicles available to commercial establishments or to anyone else were the small piston-powered helicopters. It was not the belief of anyone at that time that these piston-powered helicopters could be economically feasible. Everyone knew they could not be. But even then, it was a dream that we would obtain economically feasible helicopters which could be used commercially.

For 6 years I have sat in the committee and listened to the testimony. I am sure that many statements made on the floor of the Senate have been made in good faith so far as the recollection of those concerned is involved. But I wish to straighten out the record. These three helicopter operators have repeatedly stated before the committee that they could not possibly ever achieve an economically feasible operation until they obtained helicopters equipped with twin turbines.

Twin-turbine helicopters came into being and were first delivered in 1962. We were told repeatedly that when the twin turbine helicopters were received, the cost of the operation would be bound to go up.

This has proved to be true. The first year of operations showed an increase while the operators were getting used to the new equipment, while they were learning to handle the repairs, and all of the things that go with the operation. Then they said they should have a year or so to level off. They have had a year or two of leveling off. And now, with the two operations that have turbine helicopters, New York and Los Angeles, the costs of the operations have gone down.

I think the Senator from Colorado is in as good a position to speak impartially about this matter as anyone. There is no such service in Denver. There are probably a dozen large cities in this country, including New York, Boston, Seattle, places in the South, Philadelphia, Washington——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Minneapolis.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] says Minneapolis is one. But if I were to put that in the RECORD, I would have to put Denver in, too. There are probably a dozen cities like Cleveland, Detroit, and other cities, where, because of the concentration of population, this service is felt to be a vital necessity.

But we are not providing this service just for the people of those cities which have the service. Eighty percent of the people who use this service come from across the country and into the terminal, or else they leave that terminal and go across the country.

I believe we must form a concept of these operations in the same way that we have formed a concept of feeder airlines and trunk airlines. If we cannot get that concept and cannot understand it, we cannot understand the need for helicopter services.

We have urged the operators constantly to raise their fares. They have raised them to the extent to which they can and still make their operations feasible. They are becoming more feasible.

Let us now take the argument that other citizens are being discriminated against. We have two choices. One is to chop the subsidy off here. The Government is guaranteeing the loans on many helicopters. If we cut the operators off, we shall have to make good on those loan guarantees, and what we shall do with the helicopters when we take them over, I do not know.

The second choice is to do as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] suggests. This is not in the bill, as I said. He stated that we ought to expand the service to Atlanta and all over the country.

If we want to get ready to pay a subsidy of $80 million, $100 million, or $150 million a year, this is what we ought to do. At this stage of development, this is the only course available to us.

The program for the next few years, as outlined by the CAB, is $17.8 million, starting with $4.3 million this year, and going down to $1.1 million in 1970, and no subsidy in 1971. Frankly, so far as I am personally concerned, I feel that we ought to put a tremination date on this program before that time. I feel that we ought to give them a year or two at the most. If the helicopters have not established themselves by that time, it should be up to them to either sink or swim. I do not—and I am sorry that I cannot—agree with my distiguished chairman [Mr. MAGNUSON] who thinks that perhaps we may have to expand subsidized helicopters all over the country. I do not believe in it. I do not think it is necessary. In another year, or in another 2 years at the maximum, we either ought to find out whether we can handle this operation on an unsubsidized basis, or we ought to quit it.

There is one other feature which no one seems to have paid attention to. I shall read from the side slips. It is in the RECORD.

I asked Mr. Boyd this question:

Mr. ALLOTT. Your position in this has been very frank, and I am not sure that I agree with all of it, but it has been very frank, and I ask these questions simply so that we will understand completely here the situation we are dealing with.

Mr. BOYD. Well, I can assure you, Senator, that we try to be frank, because the last thing we want is any conflict with the Congress. We just do not want it. But we feel unless it is made absolutely clear without any vestige of doubt that $3 million is the limitation, then we feel that our obligations under section 406 of the act are to maintain the present level of subsidy for the present operation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. What Mr. Boyd told us in this testimony is that under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, he feels we would be liable for this obligation, either by appropriation from the Federal Government, or in the Court of Claims.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, to sum up:

Mr. President, we have had a subsidy for 11 years. It was designed for an infant industry—for the helicopter industry—to get the industry going through its inception.

We were told that the subsidy would be allowed for 2 or 3 years. After 11 years the industry is still receiving a subsidy. The subsidy has been greatly expanded. It was only $2 million at the start. Now it is almost twice as high.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is correct. The subsidy is not for New York, not for Los Angeles, not for Chicago, but for those who travel in helicopters. Who travels in helicopters, and why? Those who travel in helicopters are in a hurry to get from downtown New York City to one of the airports, or from downtown Chicago to O'Hare Field. Those people are willing to spend $9 or $10 to save a half an hour. I submit that the people who can afford to spend $9 or $10 to save a half hour should not be subsidized. They should pay the full cost. The Senator from Colorado is correct when he states that if we were to provide an equitable, fair helicopter service to all potential helicopter travelers in the country, it would cost $80 million or $100 million. Therefore, we should not expand this program. But if there was ever a discriminatory subsidy, if there was ever one which provided a frill and an unnecessary convenience to a handful of people, it is this subsidy.

If a Senator means it when he states that he is against unnecessary spending, he will vote against this amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachuetts would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 517 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Boggs	Lausche	Russell
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Scott
Church	McClellan	Simpson
Clark	McIntyre	Smathers
Curtis	Miller	Symington
Eastland	Moss	Thurmond
Fong	Mundt	Tower
Gore	Muskie	Walters
Holland	Pearson	Williams, Del.
Jordan, N.C.	Prouty	Young, Ohio
Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Gruening	McNamara
Allott	Hart	Mechem
Bartlett	Hartke	Metcalf
Bayh	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Morton
Bible	Hruska	Neuberger
Burdick	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Pell
Case	Jackson	Randolph
Cooper	Javits	Ribicoff
Cotton	Johnston	Salinger
Dirksen	Keating	Saltonstall
Dodd	Kuchel	Smith
Dominick	Long, La.	Sparkman
Douglas	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McCarthy	Yarborough
Fulbright	McGee	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Edmondson	Nelson
Brewster	Goldwater	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy	Talmadge
Cannon	McGovern	

So Mr. PROXMIRE'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Will the Senator suspend so the Senate may receive a message from the President of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, cor-

porations, agencies and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who I understand wishes to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, several Senators have asked me about the time situation. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has two more amendments pending. He has kindly consented to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement on time. I now request unanimous consent that the debate on the two remaining Proxmire amendments be limited to a half hour each, 15 minutes on a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is it understood that the time limitation will go into effect at the conclusion of my remarks?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the completion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

TO PROMOTE THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 333)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, did I correctly understand there is a message from the President of the United States at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it is of sufficient importance, since it relates to a grave international situation, that it be read.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message from the President of the United States will be read.

The legislative clerk read the message, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last night I announced to the American people that the North Vietnamese regime had conducted further deliberate attacks against U.S. naval vessels operating in international waters, and that I had therefore directed air action against gunboats and supporting facilities used in these hostile operations. This air action has now been carried out with substantial damage to the boats and facilities. Two U.S. aircraft were lost in the action.

After consultation with the leaders of both parties in the Congress, I further announced a decision to ask the Congress for a resolution expressing the unity and determination of the United States in supporting freedom and in protecting peace in southeast Asia.

These latest actions of the North Vietnamese regime have given a new and grave turn to the already serious situation in southeast Asia. Our commitments in that area are well known to the Congress. They were first made in 1954 by President Eisenhower. They were further defined in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty approved by the Senate in February 1955.

This treaty with its accompanying protocol obligates the United States and other members to act in accordance with their constitutional processes to meet Communist aggression against any of the parties or protocol states.

Our policy is southeast Asia has been consistent and unchanged since 1954. I summarized it on June 2 in four simple propositions:

1. America keeps her word. Here as elsewhere, we must and shall honor our commitments.

2. The issue is the future of southeast Asia as a whole. A threat to any nation in that region is a threat to all, and a threat to us.

3. Our purpose is peace. We have no military, political, or territorial ambitions in the area.

4. This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity. Our military and economic assistance to South Vietnam and Laos in particular has the purpose of helping these countries to repel aggression and strengthen their independence.

The threat to the free nations of southeast Asia has long been clear. The North Vietnamese regime has constantly sought to take over South Vietnam and Laos. This Communist regime has violated the Geneva accords for Vietnam. It has systematically conducted a campaign of subversion, which includes the direction, training, and supply of personnel and arms for the conduct of guerrilla warfare in South Vietnamese territory. In Laos, the North Vietnamese regime has maintained military forces, used Laotian territory for infiltration into South Vietnam, and most recently carried out combat operations—all in direct violation of the Geneva agreements of 1962.

In recent months, the actions of the North Vietnamese regime have become steadily more threatening. In May, following new acts of Communist aggression in Laos, the United States undertook reconnaissance flights over Laotian territory, at the request of the Government of Laos. These flights had the essential mission of determining the situation in territory where Communist forces were preventing inspection by the International Control Commission. When the Communists attacked these aircraft, I responded by furnishing escort fighters with instructions to fire when fired upon. Thus, these latest North Vietnamese attacks on our naval vessels are not the first direct attack on Armed Forces of the United States.

As President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress, on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.

As I have repeatedly made clear, the United States intends no rashness, and seeks no wider war. We must make it clear to all that the United States is united in its determination to bring about the end of Communist subversion and aggression in the area. We seek the full and effective restoration of the international agreements signed in Geneva in 1954, with respect to South Vietnam, and again at Geneva in 1962, with respect to Laos.

I recommend a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to assist nations covered by the SEATO Treaty. At the same time, I assure the Congress that we shall continue readily to explore any avenues of political solution that will effectively guarantee the removal of Communist subversion and the preservation of the independence of the nations of the area.

The resolution could well be based upon similar resolutions enacted by the Congress in the past—to meet the threat to Formosa in 1955, to meet the threat to the Middle East in 1957, and to meet the threat in Cuba in 1962. It could state in the simplest terms the resolve and support of the Congress for action to deal appropriately with attacks against our Armed Forces and to defend freedom and preserve peace in southeast Asia in accordance with the obligations of the United States under the Southeast Asia Treaty. I urge the Congress to enact such a resolution promptly and thus to give convincing evidence to the aggressive Communist nations, and to the world as a whole, that our policy in southeast Asia will be carried forward—and that the peace and security of the area will be preserved.

The events of this week would in any event have made the passage of a congressional resolution essential. But there is an additional reason for doing so at a time when we are entering on 3 months of political campaigning. Hostile nations must understand that in such a period the United States will continue to protect its national interests, and that in these matters there is no division among us.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1964.*

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 189) to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the joint resolution which has been introduced.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may request that the joint resolution be read?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to have the joint resolution read.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order? Will the Chair request the staff, and Senators also, to cease speaking, so that we may hear what is going on.

The PRESIDING OFICER. The Senate will be in order. The resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 189) was read, as follows:

Whereas naval units of the Communists regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace;

Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom;

Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander-in-Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the joint resolution. I do so with a very sad heart. But I consider the resolution, as I considered the resolution of 1955, known as the Formosa resolution, and the subsequent resolution, known as the Middle East resolution, to be naught but a resolution which embodies a predated declaration of war.

Article I, section 8 of our Constitution does not permit the President to make war at his discretion. Therefore I stand on this issue as I have stood before in the Senate, perfectly willing to take the judgment of history as to the merits of my cause. I note in passing that the warnings which the Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, and the senior Senator from Oregon uttered in 1955 in opposition to the Formosa Resolution have been proved to be correct by history. I am satisfied that history will render a final verdict in opposition to the joint resolution introduced today.

Mr. President, I shall not yield during the course of my speech, although I shall be very glad to yield to respond to questions afterward.

The senior Senator from Oregon has no illusions as to the reactions which will be aroused in some quarters in this Republic. However, I make the speech because it represents the convictions of my conscience and because I consider it essential to make it in keeping the sworn trust that I undertook when I came into this body on four different occasions and was sworn in as a Senator from the State of Oregon, pledging myself to uphold the Constitution.

I have one other remark by way of preface, not contained in the manuscript. I yield to no other Senator, or to anyone else in this country in my opposition to communism and all that communism stands for.

In our time a great struggle, which may very well be a deathlock struggle, is going on in the world between freedom on the one hand and the totalitarianism of communism on the other.

However, I am satisfied that that struggle can never be settled by war. I am satisfied that if the hope of anyone is that the struggle between freedom and communism can be settled by war, and that course is followed, both freedom and communism will lose, for there will be no victory in that war.

Because of our own deep interest in the struggle against communism, we in the United States are inclined to overlook some of the other struggles which are occupying others. We try to force every issue into the context of freedom versus communism. That is one of our great mistakes in Asia. There is much communism there, and much totalitarianism in other forms. We say we are opposing communism there, but that does not mean we are advancing freedom, because we are not.

Senators will note as I proceed in the presentation of my case in opposition to the resolution that I believe the only hope for the establishment of a permanent peace in the world is to practice our oft-repeated American professing that we believe in the substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military force as a means of settling disputes which threaten the peace of the world.

The difficulty with that professing or preaching by the United States is that the United States, like some Communist nations, does not practice it.

I wish to make one last introductory remark in the hope that more will understand the message of this speech, although we sometimes deplore the possibility of understanding on a subject matter that stirs so much emotion, so much feeling, and so much passion in the minds of so-called superpatriots, who seem to feel that if one raises any question or expresses any criticism of the policies of our country in the field of foreign policy, one's very patriotism is subject to question.

In the hope that there may be those who may wish to understand the basic tenet of the foreign policy philosophy of the senior Senator from Oregon, I wish to repeat what some of my colleagues have heard me say before.

My foreign policy philosophy is based on a great teaching of a great teacher in this body, one who undoubtedly exercised more influence on me in the field of foreign policy than any other person; a great Republican, who became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations; who was one of the architects of the San Francisco Charter; who joined with Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the announcement of that great statement in the field of foreign policy, that politics should stop at the water's edge. I refer, of course, to the incomparable Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan.

Senators within my hearing have heard me say before that I was deeply moved by that dramatic account of Arthur Vandenberg, in which he told, so many times, how he ceased being the leading isolationist in the Senate and became the leading internationalist. It was before the atomic bomb was finally perfected, but after it was known that the atomic bomb would be successful in its perfection.

Franklin Roosevelt called to the White House late one night the leaders of Congress, the leading scientists of the country, who were working on the bomb at that time, and the military leaders of our Defense Establishment who were still stationed in Washington. As Arthur Vandenberg used to say, "We were briefed, and the conference continued until the wee hours of the morning. The scientists convinced all that there was no question that the bomb would work. Then the discussion turned to the implications of this great discovery of science."

Senator Vandenberg used to say to us, "When I came out of the White House in the wee hours of that morning, I knew that while I had been in there that night, the world had so shrunken that there no longer was any place in American politics for an isolationist."

It was then that the great record of internationalism was begun to be made by the incomparable Vandenberg. I paraphrase him, but accurately, for my speech today rests upon this tenet, this unanswerable teaching of Vandenberg. This speech is my challenge today to the members of our Government and the people of my country to follow that teaching, for I do not believe that there is an implementation of any other teaching that can offer mankind any hope for peace. Unless mankind proceeds to adopt the procedures that will make possible permanent peace, both Western civilization and Communist civilization are headed for annihilation. In my judgment, we cannot find reputable scientists who will testify that either civilization could survive a nuclear war.

That tenet of Vandenberg's is as follows: There is no hope for permanent peace in the world until all the nations—not merely some, not merely those we like, not merely those we think are friendly—but until all the nations are willing to establish a system of international justice through law, to the procedures of which will be submitted each and every international dispute that

This supposedly sophisticated argument ignores several points.

First. It may not be left to us to decide whether the issue should go to the United Nations. Article 35 provides that "any member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly." The disputes referred to in article 34 are those which are likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Cambodia dragged us before the United Nations, charging violations of her border. We apologized, and suggested a U.N. border patrol to guard against future violations. But we brazened it out so fas as the Vietnam war was concerned, and served notice that we would do whatever we desired there, irrespective of the provisions of the charter.

How long we can proceed on this manner in Laos and Vietnam without being called to account at the United Nations is anyone's guess. But if we wait for another country to invoke article 35, we can be sure it will not be on grounds and under conditions most favorable to the United States.

Second. The very assumption by administration spokesmen that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances, the United States will seek U.N. action is an admission that the issue is really one of U.N. jurisdiction. What they are saying is only that they do not think that to adhere now to the U.N. Charter would serve American interests. Their theory is that the time to negotiate is when we have first dominated the battlefield.

This amounts to saying that any treaty obligation that does not serve our national interest is just a scrap of paper. These officials take the view that we may one day resurrect the U.N. Charter from the wastebasket, but not until we think it serves our interests. Perhaps now that we can level a charge against North Vietnam, they think it serves our interest.

If that is to be our policy, then we are helping to destroy the United Nations, too, and all the advances in the rule of law in world affairs which it represents. Our moral position, which we claim as leader of the free world, will be undermined and our capacity for calling others to account for breaches of the peace will be seriously compromised.

Third. The "fight now, negotiate later" line is based on the wholly illusory assumption that Red China and North Vietnam will do what we refuse to do—negotiate when they are losing. Can we really expect that when China is faced with the same condition she was faced with in Korea, she will negotiate instead of pouring her hordes into the fray, as she did in Korea? Do we really think these two countries will go to the U.N. or to the bargaining table when the war goes against them, although we refused to do so under the same circumstances? One might as well ask whether the United States would have done so in October of 1962 had the Soviet Union come to dominate the Caribbean.

As I have said in several speeches, and repeat now, we had better face the realization of the desperado that we are dealing with in Red China. This despicable Communist leader has demonstrated time and time again, as was demonstrated in the Korean war, that he places no value on human life. Only in the past 2 or 3 years headlines blazed forth the statement that the Communist leader of Red China has said in effect that in case of war with Western imperialism they could sacrifice 400 million people and have a stronger China at the end.

I know of no reason that should justify anyone engaging in the wishful thinking or in the head-in-the-sand attitude that if we kill enough and bomb enough, North Vietnam and Red China will yield.

We need the world with us. By that I mean we need with us the nations of the world which believe in the resort to the rule of law in the settlement of disputes.

We shall not take these nations with us if we follow a unilateral military course of action in Asia that may result in the despicable Communist Chinese leader starting to send his hordes of human bodies against American military force.

I reject the premise, which I believe is clearly imbedded in the joint resolution which was introduced in the Senate today: "Fight now and negotiate later."

That is risky business. It would jeopardize the continuation of existing procedures for the peaceful settlement through negotiations of disputes which threaten the peace of the world.

A nation does not have to commit the first violation in order to be in violation of the Geneva Accords. And it does not have to commit aggression in order to be in violation of the United Nations Charter.

We have violated these accords and the U.N. Charter time and time again. We are pursuing neither law nor peace in southeast Asia. We are not even pursuing freedom. We are maintaining a military dictatorship over the people of South Vietnam, headed by an American puppet to whom we give the orders, and who moves only under our orders.

Whoever fights a war without taking the matter to the United Nations is in violation of the charter, whether that party started the fighting or not. We cannot hide behind the alibi that others violated these agreements first, although they did. To the contrary, it makes it more important that we lay the charges before the United Nations, or to a 14-nation conference, or seek to bring SEATO in to exercise peacekeeping policies until the U.N. can take jurisdiction.

FOLLY OF WAR IN ASIA

All the foregoing is important to the United States, but none of it is as important as the folly of our getting involved in a war in Asia, irrespective of legal or moral obligations. No American spokesman has ever given the American people a single reason why an American war on the Chinese mainland would be justified.

The day of the westerner is finished in Asia, just as much as in Africa. And it no longer matters whether the westerner is French, Dutch, British, or American. The pressure will always be against us and against our front in South Vietnam.

That is why the pious apologies for our present policy which deplore expansion of the war into North Vietnam or China, but insist that we cannot leave under pressure, have been so futile.

There will never be anything but pressure against us there so long as the local government is dependent upon us for its existence. There is no reason to think the rebellion against Khanh will ever die out. Although it may recede somewhat in the face of our overwhelming military might, it will rebound whenever we try to reduce the level of American participation.

Our best prospect for us in South Vietnam was for stalemate; but the longer the stalemate continued, the more inevitable it was the war would be escalated. And it has been escalated, and how much further it will be escalated no one can say.

The public statements by Secretary McNamara, Secretary Rusk, Admiral Felt, and General Harkins required that the United States expand the war if the Communist-led forces did not retreat from their gains in Laos and Vietnam, and American forces from nearby bases in the Philippines and Okinawa have been poised for air attacks in Laos and North Vietnam and for the entry of ground forces through Thailand into Laos.

In my opinion, our leaders counted on bluffing Communist China; but she was not bluffed in Korea when the whole United Nations was with us, and this time we have not one single ally. The faltering General Khanh has arranged for us to carry out those threats so far as North Vietnam is concerned. We may find that someone else will arrange for us to carry them out against China, too. If that time comes, we will have no choice but to resort to nuclear weapons with all the hideous consequences that entails.

Yet, the fact remains that nothing we set out to do in 1954 justifies what we are doing today, much less what we are threatening to do. We set out in 1954 to put Humpty-Dumpty back together again when we tried to establish an American foothold in southeast Asia out of the destruction of European colonialism.

Five and one half billion dollars worth of aid to South Vietnam, 18,000 American "advisers," and now the threat of war with China has not put Humpty-Dumpty back together—and never will. Out of this $5½ billion, $1¼ billion went to France to help her in the Indochina war prior to her withdrawing in 1954. Today we are spending better than $1½ million per day and will reach $2 million shortly, just as aid to Vietnam, not covering the cost of our own military force in southeast Asia. Unless the American people make their voices heard very soon, they are going to spend even more in this fruitless and unavailing task.

What this war in the last 36 hours has cost the American taxpayers and how much it will amount to as that war continues defies imagination.

HOPE FOR PEACE LIES WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF UNITED NATIONS

The stark reality is that North and South Vietnam, China, and the United States are in this hour endangering the peace of the world. We have said we will make charges against North Vietnam before the United Nations Security Council.

Why in the world we did not make those charges against North Vietnam several years ago, I shall never understand. We are going to make charges now because we are in open conflict with North Vietnam. But we have had evidence for years that North Vietnam was undoubtedly a violator of the Geneva Accords of 1954. But instead of taking our charges and our proof to the United Nations, we sent 15,000 military personnel to South Vietnam to engage in unilateral military action in South Vietnam, in violation of three articles of the Geneva Accord that I have already cited in this speech, and have violated, time and time again, article after article of the United Nations Charter. That is our sorry record.

What about the infiltration of North Vietmanese into South Vietnam to advise the Vietcong?

What about the 21,000 American troops in South Vietnam advising the Government?

What about the American air attack on North Vietnam naval bases?

What about the shelling of the islands in Tonkin Bay by South Vietnamese vessels? These were all clear acts of war.

Why is not Ambassador Stevenson going to lay these incidents, too, before the Security Council?

The best hope for peace would seem to be that the noncombatant members of the United Nations will see to it that all of the provocative activities in the Indochina peninsula are brought before the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, in accordance with the procedures of the Charter. They should invoke all—I repeat: all—the applicable provisions of the United Nations Charter irrespective of which country initiates charges or must be called to account.

They should call upon South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, China, and the United States to stop their fighting and proceed to the conference table, where there can be applied the rules of reason rather than the fortunes of war for the settlement of the conflict.

These U.N. members not involved in this conflict must face up to one of the great challenges in all history. If they do not, they will see the United Nations Charter consumed as a casualty in the war flames of the struggle. They must enforce the Charter against all who are fighting in Asia. That is the issue—the issue of peace or war—that is facing them as well as us.

I close by pleading that my country, and its people, not forsake the moral principles and values which cry out to be saved in this hour. I plead with them not to commit themselves to a unilateral war in Asia for purposes which many of their own political leaders were ill advised in the first place. There is still no answer to the Biblical injunction:

He shall judge among many people and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks.

The United States has everything to gain and little to lose by seeking to implement that teaching at an international conference table.

The United States has much to lose and little to gain by continuing our unilateral military action in southeast Asia, unsanctioned by the United Nations and unaccompanied by allies.

No nation in history has had such a great opportunity as this one now has to strike a blow for peace at an international conference table.

I shall not support any substitute which takes the form of a predated declaration of war. In my judgment, that is what the pending joint resolution is.

I shall not support any delegation of the duty of Congress—of Congress, not the President—to determine an issue of war or peace.

I shall not support any substitute which takes the form of military action to expand the war or that encourages our puppets in Saigon to expand the war.

Adherence to the United Nations Charter is the only policy that affords the hope of leading the American people out of this jam without a war. I shall continue to plead for such a policy as long as time remains.

If war overtakes us first, then we will have no choice but to unite behind its prosecution.

But, first, that calls for a declaration of war and not a resolution that seeks to authorize the President to make war without our declaring war. That was the position I took in 1955; and I incorporate by reference every argument I used in opposition to a preventive war resolution of that date.

But I see no more chance of conventional military victory in North Vietnam and China than in South Vietnam, and I therefore plead that the SEATO treaty and the United Nations Charter, rather than solitary force of arms, guide our actions in southeast Asia.

I am convinced that a continuation of the U.S. unilateral military action in southeast Asia, which has now taken on the aspects of open aggressive fighting, endangers the peace of the world.

Mr. President, in yielding the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously agreed to, the two amendments will be granted 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1172 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment (No. 1172) submitted by Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

On page 47, line 4, strike out "$4,413,594,000" and insert "$4,313,594,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I modify the amendment so as to read:

On page 47, line 4, strike out "$4,413,594,000" and insert "$4,345,000,000."

On page 47, line 9, strike out "$262,880,500" and insert "$245,000,000."

On page 42, line 23, strike out "$623,525,500" and insert "$610,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will explain the modification as I go along.

There are many arguments against proceeding rapidly with the space program. I shall not make those arguments.

We know about the limited scientific manpower available in this country. It is one of our most precious assets.

I have felt for a long time that we should make a study of the availability of scientific manpower where it can be allocated in wholesale lots, as has been done in the space program, at the expense of defense and at the expense of industry itself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. While the study conducted on scientific manpower by the Subcommittee on Manpower Employment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which subcommittee I am chairman, was not in so great a depth as one might desire, if we are thinking only in terms of the study of scientific manpower. That study, the results of which have been made public, makes it clear that scientific manpower is almost desperately in short supply in a number of areas in the country, and that the prognosis for remedying that short supply is a most pessimistic one. It seems reasonably clear that for at least another 5 or 10 years we shall not have anything like enough trained scientific manpower to take care of all the legitimate needs of the economy, private as well as public. It shows, further, that an undue percentage of our scientific manpower is now completely under the control of the Government in connection

with military development and space developments.

Therefore, I support what the Senator has said so far, with respect to the need to look carefully into the utilization of scientific manpower in the space program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania very much. My point, Mr. President, is that this amendment does not rely on the argument that scientific trained manpower must be conserved.

Mr. President, this space program is extremely costly. It costs more than $5 billion. It is one of the three or four most expensive programs in the Federal Government.

My amendment does not act as a meat cleaver. There is no 10-percent cut. There is no basic policy challenge involved. The amendment merely goes back to the level in every respect that was approved by the Appropriations Committee of the House. At least one member of that committee thought there should be a billion-dollar cut in the NASA appropriations, but I do not agree with that.

What the amendment does is to cut the Senate appropriations $100 million, back to the level which the House felt, after careful study, was all that was necessary to do the full, complete, total space job.

The House provided $4,345 million for research and development. The Senate has increased that by $68 million. My amendment would eliminate that increase. It would reduce NASA research and development by only 1½ percent.

On the basis of careful scrutiny and study by the staff and the experts on the House Appropriations Committee, it was felt that this was still a generous amount. Incidentally, it is an 11-percent increase, a substantial increase over what it was last year—the 1964 approved budget.

For construction, the House approved $245 million, the Senate $263 million.

My amendment would go back to the House and reduce the appropriation by $18 million, the full amount of the House recommendation.

For administration, the House approved $610 million, the Senate committee $624 million.

The Senate figure is some $130 million over last year's figure, an increase of a whopping 25 percent in a single year in overhead.

My amendment would pare the increase so that it would still constitute a substantial increase, in the neighborhood of 20 percent, but would not be so excessive as the Senate committee has recommended.

My amendment is based on the 1969 target date. It is not based upon the theory that the 1969 target date is impracticable. It permits the full Apollo leadtime, although that program depends on the successful Gemini project—and Gemini has not been proved yet. It is proposed to land men, not merely instruments, on the moon. It involves no contention that space appropriations be cut because of defense, education, or other priorities. The amendment would make a careful, relatively small and modest, limited reduction in the space program. This is such a vast program. The reduction would amount to $100 million, but goes back to the House figures which, as I say, were carefully arrived at.

I believe that in view of the great amount of money involved, the rapid increase in space spending, the fact that we still allow an 11-percent increase, and an increase of more than $400 million to be spent in the space program for research and development, my amendment deserves serious consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senate is in a somewhat unusual position on the Space Agency appropriation. As I pointed out earlier, the House tentatively discussed a figure for the Committee on Science and Astronauts prior to the authorization. But they had no guidelines for appropriation. They had to guess as to what would or would not be authorized.

The House is very meticulous in these matters. I must frankly say that they have a better opportunity to go over the items line by line than we do in the Senate. In the House, a member of the Committee on Appropriations can serve only on one committee and one subcommittee. House Members spend much more time on a specific matter. But in this particular case, they had very little opportunity to make comparisons. They went ahead anyway. Then a point of order was made on the floor, and the whole amount was eliminated. The Senate in this particular case had to start afresh.

In the meantime, the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the House Committee on Science and Astronauts held long hearings and completed them.

I believe the statement was made by all Senators on both committees that they know of no time when they have been more detailed in their examination of these items, and that the authorization was down to rock bottom if we were to achieve the items set forth by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the administration, and the space exploration program.

The Senate committee practically unanimously, not knowing what the House would do or would not do in view of the situation, took the full amount of the authorization by our own committee, which testimony was to the effect that they had already given it a fine tooth combing so that we could go to the House in conference and start with them fresh in arriving at this amount.

I do not suggest that the conference will agree to the full amount of the authorization. In any event, I do not think it would be fair to the House conferees if we did not take the authorized amount so that the conferees could work its will on that amount. Therefore I recommend that we keep the amount in the bill, and that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin be rejected. I do not make this recommendation necessarily because the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is not well taken in terms of the dollars and cents figure. I do it because I think the legislative situation would require us to go to conference with the tight authorization amount and then work something out which might end as close to the figures of the Senator from Wisconsin as his own amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that we took not only the authorized 1965 amount for this appropriation, but also considered a supplemental item for 1964 of $141 million, which was submitted earlier in the year? And it covered the amount due on contracts in the fiscal year 1964. We allowed only half of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. We are really about $70-odd million under the total of the two amounts, the authorization of this year and the $141 million supplemental items to wind up 1964.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator that we ought to take the full amount. I insisted in the committee upon including the entire $141 million. It covered items which were important items having to do with the Gemini program on contracts that were let back in 1964.

I felt that we were being penny wise and pound foolish in not allowing the full amount of that item. I fully agree with the Senator's insistence that all the funds recommended in the authorization bill by no means covered the full budget request—instead, we cut that down pretty well—and in this bill we recommend that the authorized amount be allowed plus only half of the supplemental item which we considered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that in 1964 we allowed $5,100 million for this item, and later passed a supplemental authorization of $141 million, which was primarily for the Apollo program. The authorization for fiscal 1965 is $5,227,506,000. We have not appropriated any funds against the supplemental authorization of $141 million, so that authorization is still available. When we combine these, we actually have a total authorization of $5,368 million, but we took $5,300 million, which is $68 million under the authorization.

I can understand the problems that face the Senator from Wisconsin. They are not problems which are peculiar to him or peculiar to any Senator. But if he wants to get at the problem which he is considering, what he ought to do, I suggest, is to take this matter up with the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and handle it by way of authorization. It is here that the policies of the space program will be determined.

The policies have been determined. This committee, although it has not provided the complete authorization by less than $68 million—and it was the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who authored this—has done what it thought was the only logical thing. It basically put this item in conference with the House of Representatives, less the $68 million.

Then we shall have an opportunity to compromise between our figure and the figure that the House arrived at as being the logical, reasonable figure for the entire program. We can then decide somewhere between the $5.3 billion and the House figure, and decide where we are going and what we are going to do.

We realized—and the distinguished chairman of the committee mentioned this when the bill was brought up this afternoon—that this is a hard, tough thing to decide. It is hard to decide what we are going to do.

I have been on this committee for only 6 years. But never before have we faced a situation in which an entire appropriation was struck out in the House, so that we were the first to appropriate on a particular item. I suggest that this is really the best way to look at it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator has so well stated, but in a little different way, was that what faced our committee was the full authorization plus $141 million as a supplemental item. Those two figures together are $168 million above what the House appropriated.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So we took $100 million of that and placed it in the figure to make an even figure of $5,300 million, as opposed to their $5,200 million. So we were $100 million over the House, and $68 million less than the full amount which we could have appropriated if we saw fit.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. I would not try to claim that any individual Senator has omniscience in this field. But this was the best solution we thought we could find. I think it is a logical and a good solution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the House did take the $141 million supplemental provision fully into consideration in arriving at its figure? The House report, on page 15 reads:

> The committee considered budget estimates totaling $5,445 million for the space program, including $141 million for a supplemental item, and $5,304 million in the 1965 budget estimates.

In other words, the House had the same figure the full, total figure before it when it made its appropriation just as we have the figure before us now.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is partially right in that the $141 million figure was in the budget. But it was not in the authorization until after the House had considered it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may be privileged to be heard——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have the honor to sit on the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, which authorized the 1965 legislation, and also on the conference. We had long and difficult hearings on the authorization bill. Then when the bill went to conference, we had another difficult situation. We worked out a bill which was decidedly under the budget recommendation for the authorization bill. When we got into the Appropriations Committee work we found that we had that before us the new authorized amount for fiscal 1965, plus the $141 million suplemental item that had not been up before the Appropriations Committee before, which had been waiting for action for a good many months, relating to 1964 contracts, and we had a brandnew bill so far as this whole field was concerned due to what had happened in the House.

The upshot of it was exactly as stated by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. We decided to put in the full amount of the 1965 authorization, which represented a large give and take between the two Houses.

Also it represented a large diminution of the original budgeted amount for the authorization bill this year, since we added to it only half of the $141 million, which was reduced under my protest. I felt that we should have added the full amount of $141 million. It seems to me that having seen only recently what the space program is doing, I believe the whole nation is proud of the recent *Ranger 7* exploits—the shots that were taken of the moon and televised back to the earth. We have some of those shots here. Taking into consideration the other things that were done that were outstanding in this field, such as weather satellites, which far exceed anything done elsewhere, and communication satellites, which far exceed anything done by anyone else, and the uniform success that we have had in the Mercury project in launching our men and bringing them back safely to earth, and the fact that undoubtedly now we have overtaken the Soviets and have passed them in many of the scientific fields, and considering the fact also that it is in Research and Development that most of this work takes place, it seems to me that we should take no smaller action than has been reported and recommended by the committee.

I feel very strongly about this. In a recent report—within the last month—the National Science Foundation has shown that the total amount devoted by the Nation this year to Research and Development is something better than $20 billion, of which about $15 billion is public money and $5 billion is private money, expended by the great industries themselves that are involved in all of the various fields in which we are moving forward. The $20 billion fund applies not only to space but also to all of our research and less than one-fourth of that is being expended in this vital and successful space effort.

Considering the important place which the space effort has in the whole picture, it seems to me that we should not reduce it, and particularly so at this time, when the subject has not been considered yet by the House itself, and we have before us a difficult conference situation. I do not know whether I shall be on the conference which will be held on this bill. However, I was a member of the conference on the authorization bill, and it was difficult enough as we tried to reconcile the points of view between the two Houses. I hope we shall not handicap the Senate conferees, whoever they are, who go into this conference. I know from experience that this is a difficult subject, and I think that this is the toughest bill in conference that has to be handled in the course of the full year, because it involves all of the independent agencies, which spend so much money and have such variant activities.

The distinguished Senator from Washington and the members of his committee to a lesser degree must be experts in some 30 different fields in order to work the bill through the committee and then handle it in conference. I hope that we shall stand by him implicitly on this subject.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time limitation be extended for 15 minutes. I make the request for the reason that when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and I entered into the agreement, I neglected to recall that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] wished to express some opinions on the subject. He is a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we have before the Senate for consideration the independent offices appropriation bill, H.R. 10456, which includes a Senate amendment containing the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in a total amount of $5,300 million. This total includes the $5,227,506,000 authorized earlier this year for NASA for fiscal year 1965 and an additional $72,494,000 authorized for fiscal year 1964, but unappropriated.

Mr. President, the purpose of my speaking today is to defend this amendment containing funds to carry out our national civilian space program for fiscal year 1965. We have come a long way since the first of February 1958, when we made our first launch sending into orbit a total of 30.8 pounds. There have been objections raised to our civilian space program but I do not believe that anyone can quarrel with the tremendous strides our Nation has made in space exploration in the short period of 6 years. One need only to contrast our initial endeavor of placing 30.8 pounds in orbit with the successful launch on the 29th of January this year of Saturn I placing into orbit a total of 38,700 pounds to

be aware of our accomplishments. Furthermore, the United States can point with pride to the complete success of the *Ranger 7* shot which recently photographed the moon from altitudes as low as 1,000 feet. Such a success even though we experienced some previous frustrating failures is indicative of the accomplishments that our Nation has made in the short period of 6 years.

Since the initiation of our national space policy by President Kennedy in 1961, the funding for this program has received practically bipartisan support. We have seen this program upgraded from a total appropriation of $1,671,750,000 which was appropriated to NASA for fiscal year 1962 to $5,100 million appropriated for fiscal year 1964 and $5,227,506,000 authorized for fiscal year 1965.

Mr. President, I am well aware of the fact that this shows a tremendous level of growth over the past 2 or 3 years. I personally feel, however, that this large acceleration in funding was necessary in order to provide our Nation with the basic tools necessary to achieve our goal of preeminence in space within a reasonable timetable. It is also my personal opinion that the funding for this program will now seek a level somewhere in the vicinity of $5 billion since the greater portion of our national capability in facilities and personnel has been accomplished. I need only point out that the fact that NASA's request for construction of facilities dropped from a total of $800 million requested and $680 million appropriated in fiscal year 1964 to a total of $281 million requested and $262,880,500 authorized for fiscal year 1965. This indicates that by far the larger portion of NASA's facilities have been completed or are in the process of completion. Likewise, total personnel for NASA requested for fiscal year 1965 was relatively unchanged from its requirements for fiscal year 1964.

Having participated in the hearings as a member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee I firmly supported the Senate's position with respect to NASA's authorization request for this fiscal year. I do so well aware of the fact that certain criticisms have been raised with respect to the administration's civilian space program. These criticisms stem, for the most part, from three basic arguments: First, that there is no necessity to accomplish a landing on the moon and return by 1970 and that this program could be stretched out and would make little difference if such a landing and return were planned for 1975 or 1980; second, that the buildup of the civilian space program has been at the expense of our military space program and that less money should be appropriated for our civilian space efforts and more placed in our military space efforts; and, third, that the money being appropriated for our civilian space program is just too much and would be better spent on other types of research or on other national programs.

I do not intend to address myself to the argument of whether or not we should land and return from the moon by 1970 or 1975 or 1980. The administration made a national policy determination in 1960 to land and return from the moon in this decade. I supported this national policy and still support such policy as I feel that only by establishing a goal can we achieve the overall policy of becoming preeminent in space. When we have accomplished such goal we will have provided the proper pacing for the establishment of the facilities and the know-how which will allow this Nation to determine in what ways it will maintain such preeminence. This Nation will not have to be always coming from behind by watching other nations accomplish space missions without our Nation being able to match such science and technology. We will have the option of determining which missions will be most important to us in space. I have personally considered the administration's program to achieve preeminence and I have found it to be a soundly worked out and a forward moving program which is being carried out in an economical manner and not on a crash basis. In my opinion it will provide the foundation for the gathering of the scientific know-how and the establishing of the operational capability to reach, and what is more important to maintain, this Nation's preeminence in space.

I further believe that the stretching out of this national program after the impetus has been established to carry out such program within a specified time framework, could not help but cost vastly more in the end even though perhaps the funding requirement for this fiscal year or the next fiscal year might be less.

With respect to those persons who feel that our civilian space program is being enhanced at the expense of the military space program I would only like to say that during my years in the Senate I have always been cognizant of the necessity to build and maintain as strong a military posture as is necessary to defend our Nation against any aggressor be it by land, sea or air and I fully realize that our Nation must be capable of preventing any surprise by any aggressor who may, in the future, utilize space as a medium. I firmly believe that those who feel that the administration is neglecting our Nation's capability to defend itself in space are not really quarreling with our national space effort by both the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, but simply differ with respect to the manner in which basic space technology is being developed and managed and perhaps they are prematurely assessing our military space applications.

Mr. President, the amendment is rather simple in the figures stated. Those of us who are charged with the responsibility of the program on two committees of the Senate, the authorization and the Appropriations Committee, have finally come down to the figures stated, which in round numbers total $5.3 billion, which is over $100 million under the budget for this year as originally submitted, and in round numbers it is $75 million above the House figure for this year's budget.

The figures are a little complicated at that point, because there is about $70 million of last year's authorization that is carried over, but in round numbers—and the amendment is submitted with the greatest of faith, I know—the Senator would reduce the item by $100 million. I submit to the Senate that if there is any adjustment to make in those figures, the probabilities are that it could be better done and done more soundly by the men who will be chosen to sit around the conference table that have already been wrestling with the problem for months, and let them find a common ground on which to settle. I believe commonsense would lead us to that conclusion.

I am willing really to submit the question on that basis. But I do wish to take a moment to point out what I think would be some of the consequences if we take a meat ax approach and lop off $100 million from the figure that has been agreed upon finally by our committee. We have advanced into the lunar program now for 30 months and we have committed billions of dollars already. That program would be postponed in time from 9 to 12 months. That within itself could add additional cost to the program of operation during that time, which we know could run into many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. President, I had the privilege of holding the first extensive hearings that were held by the Aeronautical and Space Committee on the broad program. I sat there in amazement to hear the testimony, and I did not believe that one-tenth of it could be done.

But as one year has followed another, it is an amazing thing the way they have fulfilled their expectations, with only a small slippage in time, and have brought this country to the point, as the Senator from Florida has said, where we are already undoubtedly superior in that field.

The so-called moonshot is the greatest demonstration of our true mastery of space—and not merely for the purpose of going to the moon alone, but for mastery of space, something in which we cannot afford to be second best.

Mr. President, I am not, of course, a military expert; however, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, I have participated in the establishment of our Nation's defense programs for a number of years. I am aware that at the present time the Department of Defense is carrying out a tremendous research and development program; and that such a program includes substantial funding for military space activities. As of such time as the Department of Defense can provide me with the character and the requirements for additional military space missions, I will be among the vanguard to support such programs. In the meantime, I am cognizant of the fact that perhaps there is a closer coordination between our civilian and military space activities than there is between any other department or agency of the Government.

That has been true over the last few years, under which the program has come to fine fruition under the Secretary of Defense and under NASA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the defense part of the program and the NASA part dovetail together so as to complement each other; that we granted the full amount for the space program for defense; and that to diminish this NASA program would leave them out of kilter with each other?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the point I am trying to develop.

Up and down throughout the entire NASA organization and the entire Military Establishment daily contacts are being made. A surprising number of military personnel are actively working on a 24-hour-a-day assignment with NASA. I need only to indicate such ranking military men as Adm. W. F. Boone and Gen. Sam Phillips who are working full time with NASA in order to give examples of such close coordination. While it is true that some of these ranking military officers are retired, surely no one can say that they are not cognizant of our military requirements. A tremendous amount of information feeds back daily through the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board composed of high-level NASA and military personnel. At Cape Kennedy our military launch operations and our civilian launch operations operate side by side. Close coordination exists at the topmost policy levels up to and including the Administrator of NASA and the Secretary of Defense.

Let me mention in that connection General McKee, whose services were so valued that he was given a ceremony at the White House on retirement. He is moving his desk over to NASA, and is one of the most valuable men in the entire military organization. NASA was glad to take him. His moving in there is a fine example of the coordination between the two organizations, and the need of one for the other.

While I am sure there can be shown individual cases where coordination has been lacking, nevertheless, I am convinced that as a result of executive policy and, in part, as a result of congressional persuasion, there is a genuine attempt at the highest policy level to coordinate space activities as effectively as possible.

Mr. President, I am also aware that in carrying out our national civilian objectives we are not only creating the know-how and the facilities necessary in the event of a future requirement to carry out military activities in space, but we are also establishing the industrial capability which can be immediately mobilized should the circumstances require it.

Let us never write off a loss of money we are spending in the industrial development that goes with this vital program.

We, as a Nation, have learned our lesson. One need only look back to our governmental aeronautical research activities prior to World War I. The United States flew a heavier than air vehicle as far back as 1907. Yet, in 1914 and 1915 when heavier than air vehicles were utilized for the first time in warfare the United States did not have the industrial capability to provide such vehicles. This is not true at the present time with respect to space. Our aerospace corporations are actively engaged in programs, not only for NASA, but also for the military. We shall not be found wanting again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield that time to him.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in exploring space, our Nation as well as any other nation is straining at the state-of-the-art and technology. We are moving into a medium where relatively little is known. As we move into such a medium we are confident that we can stay abreast in the field of scientific discovery and its application to space with any other nation. In this medium it is not a case of being able to defend ourselves by building 10 planes to every 5 planes of a potential aggressor nation or 5 ships to 2 ships or 3 tanks to 1 tank in order to establish our superiority. By staying abreast of advancements in science and technology our Nation will be able to prevent any surprise in this new medium. Our national space program is geared to this accomplishment. As for the present, our Nation subscribes to the philosophy that space should be explored for peaceful purposes, and we will do so. However, should an aggressor attempt to utilize this medium for warlike activities in the future, I am confident that our Nation will be prepared to defend itself.

As for the argument that we are spending too much at the expense of our research and other national programs, my only comment is let each such program stand on its own feet. Our civilian scientific programs are well balanced in my opinion. The achievements and results which will flow from this tremendous scientific effort will be enormous. Already applications which affect our welfare are being recognized. However, the overall benefits to our national and individual well-being are incapable of being calculated at this time. History has taught us that nations which stand pat deteriorate. We do not want this to happen to the United States.

Mr. President, because of the above reasons, I firmly support the appropriation to NASA for fiscal year 1965 and recommend its adoption by the Senate.

I have already emphasized the need from the military standpoint. I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer, but I want to say with all the emphasis I can that this figure is as hard, as firm, and as conservative a figure as the Senate can work out for this bill. With all deference to the Senator from Wisconsin or any other Member of the Senate, I believe it is a firmer, harder, and a more needed figure than we would be able to work out on chance in voting the amendment up or down.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is not a meat-ax cut. It is paring. This is less than a 2-percent cut. All the amendment does is cut the appropriation from $5.3 billion to $5.2 billion, and in doing so saves $100 million. It does not do it in an arbitrary way. It cuts it back to the precise figure which the House Appropriations Committee thought was adequate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How does the proposed cut compare with the cut proposed by the Senator from Arkansas? It is my understanding that he offered an amendment. I am not sure how much the proposed cut was.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In 1963 the Senator from Arkansas proposed a 10-percent cut. This is less than a 2-percent cut. The amendment proposed at that time by Senator FULBRIGHT was a $500 million cut. This is only a $100 million cut.

The main argument made against my amendment is that it would delay the program and perhaps keep us from developing superiority that we are obviously developing in space as compared with the Soviet Union.

Exactly the same arguments were made last year. The Senate refused to accept that argument. It adopted the Proxmire amendment and cut the appropriation back to the House level. At that time it was a $90 million cut. It did not delay the program. It has been said this afternoon by Senators who opposed my cut last year that we will still be able to stay ahead and on schedule with the moon program. Nobody says that the past NASA appropriations have not been adequate. They still say we will get to the moon in 1969.

The Senator from Mississippi, who is such an eloquent spokesman for full appropriations in this field, admitted that we are undoubtedly superior to the Russians in space.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know the Senator would not want to misstate anything, but the testimony before the committee was that if this money were cut, it would put the program back a whole year, and it would cost us more than $100 million to catch up.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. That was the testimony in 1963.

Mr. ALLOTT. And in 1964.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was the testimony in 1962. It has been the testimony consistently. It was the argument made on the floor of the Senate in 1963. My point is that statements to the effect that if we cut the appropriation we shall postpone our schedule and never get to the moon have proved to be false. That is what happened in 1963. It was said that if we cut the appropriation back to the House figure we would never get to the moon in 1970 or 1971. We cut it. What happened? Now we are told that we shall get there by 1969.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not a fact that the agency had to come back for an addi-

tional authorization of $141 million in order to bolster its program?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; it had to come back for additional funds, part of which are now being considered in the pending measure.

Mr. ALLOTT. It did have to spend them in order to maintain an orderly rate of progress. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It had to come back; that is true. The argument of the Senator from Wisconsin is that it is about time to provide some real cost discipline for NASA. This agency has grown faster than any other agency, from a $900 million appropriation only a few years ago to more than $5 billion today. All of us knows of many examples of waste in this agency. If we cut back to the figures agreed to by the House I am sure we shall be able to maintain our schedule. My amendment makes good economy and it makes good sense. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I favor a reduction in the funds for the Apollo project in order to bring about a reevaluation of the goal of trying to land a man on the moon this decade, and to insure that we proceed with exploration of space on a more deliberate and thoughtful basis. I do not contend that we should cancel this project. This Nation obviously will continue to pioneer in space—as we did only a few days ago in photographing the moon. I contend only that it is unwise to continue the manned lunar program on a crash basis. NASA's entire tree will not wither away just because the Senate nips off a few buds. And in spite of what NASA officials say, I, for one, regard any Government program that grows tenfold in 5 years—from $523 million in 1960 to $5.3 billion in 1965—as a crash program.

As Members of the Senate know, the Federal budget is a listing of priorities, reflecting national needs as determined by the President and the Congress. In deciding the proper appropriation level for funding NASA activities in the 1965 fiscal year, the Senate will in effect be determining whether reaching the moon this decade deserves priority treatment over all the pressing, unmet needs in the public sector of our economy here on earth. This program consumes 20 percent of the funds available for all domestic programs. Senators must decide whether or not it warrants this high priority. I do not contend that by reducing funds for the lunar program we could automatically transfer the amounts saved to meeting domestic requirements. But I do believe that by ridding ourselves of the straitjacket timetable which requires pursuing this program on a crash basis, the budgetary climate next year will be improved considerably for bills designed to make life more bearable on this planet.

Under this bill a total of $2,749,994,000 is allocated to the Apollo project, more than half the proposed appropriation for NASA. NASA officials have told the Congress that some $35 billion will be spent on space activities this decade—$20 billion of this leading to the manned lunar landing. To meet this announced objective, $23 billion more must be appropriated in the next 5 years—an average of $4.6 billion per year; more than is budgeted this year for all Federal programs of education, natural resource development and housing, and community improvement.

Actually, $7 billion has been requested for space activities in the 1965 fiscal year budget, including $1.47 billion for the military space program and smaller amounts for other agencies with space projects. I might point out that the estimate given the Congress in 1960 for the cost of space exploration in the decade amounted to less than half the current cost estimate. I will discuss this inflation aspect of space programs in more detail later in my statement.

I wish to digress a few moments to discuss a recently published tabulation of scientific opinion on various aspects of the space program. Two thousand members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science were selected at random to receive a questionnaire prepared by the editors of Science Magazine, the official journal of the association. The results of this poll shed considerable light on attitudes within the scientific community on the space program. I ask unanimous consent to have the poll results printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Permit me to summarize a number of the more pertinent findings. Sixty-two percent of those who replied said they did not believe it was vital to the national interest that high priority be given to a landing on the moon by 1970. In reply to a related question, only 20 percent felt that a reasonable objective would be a landing by 1970. The remainder who responded to the question said it should be 1975 or later. Seven percent apparently were of the opinion that a manned landing would never be a reasonable objective. Of those working directly or indirectly in space programs, only 28 percent believed that 1970 was a reasonable goal—33 percent favored 1975 and there were smaller percentages who favored later target dates. Fifty-eight percent felt that pursuit of science was the most important justification for the lunar landing program—only 13 percent listed national prestige as first. Military aspects influenced 7 percent, technological fallout rated 6 percent and a surprising 2 percent thought the program was justified as a public works project. When it came to their opinions on the potential of various fields of research for producing new knowledge, the scientists obviously considered the manned lunar program quite low in priority. Only 25 percent placed lunar research in the top three rankings compared with 93 percent for biomedical research, 37 percent for oceanography, 66 percent for physics research, and 62 percent for chemical research.

This poll admittedly was not conducted on a scientific basis and it cannot be said categorically that it reflects a consensus of opinion of the Nation's scientists. But it is the best indicator we have to date of how scientists feel about the space program. There has been so much pie-in-the-sky talk about technological fallout, for example, that it is somewhat enlightening to find that only a handful of scientists consider this to be sufficient justification for our major goal in space.

And that only 10 percent of these scientists rated manned space exploration as the top ranking field for production of new knowledge. And, although it may be argued that scientists are not as well qualified as politicians to gage its significance, few thought that national prestige justified manned exploration of the moon at all—even fewer listed the military aspects as of prime importance. It is abundantly clear that the program can be justified only on scientific grounds to most and the potential of this field ranks very low on the research totem pole in the opinions of these scientists.

Two major points have been advanced in opposition to slowing down the manned lunar program. First, it is said that our Nation would lose great prestige if we abandoned the goal, and, second, that the program will cost more if it is stretched out. Let me discuss each of these briefly.

Regardless of what our space officials say in denying a race with the Russians, we have placed ourselves in a posture where the American public and the world believe we are engaged in a race. Whether or not the Russians are trying to beat us is really not important. What is important is that we dispel the world of the idea that we are irrevocably committed to both beating the Russians to the moon and getting there by 1970. The Russians in this situation have shown a great deal more sense than we have. Apparently, they are trying to reach the moon but are not in a position of being the vanquished if we get there first. Khrushchev was quoted as saying during his visit to Denmark:

> It is unimportant who gets there first. If the Americans get there before us we can use their experience.

If, as our space officials say, we are not racing to the moon, what is the sense of retaining a goal which appears impossible to attain? We are out on a limb and are sawing it through with repeated statements of adherence to the pre-1970 goal. Mr. Webb told both the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Appropriations Committees that we have only a "fighting chance" to reach the moon in this decade and according to Dr. Welsh, of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, we have only a "50–50" chance of beating the Russians there. The Space Committee was also told by Mr. Webb that:

> If we do not receive the funds which the President has requested, there is nothing left to sacrifice except the national goal itself.

The "fighting chance" Mr. Webb referred to was based on the assumption that NASA would receive $141 million in supplemental funds for the 1964 fiscal year in addition to the full budget request for the 1965 fiscal year. In a letter to me dated February 14, 1964, a NASA official stated:

> If the $141 million fiscal year 1964 supplemental is not allowed but the 1965 budget request is approved, we estimate that the delay in accomplishing manned lunar landing will approximate 6 months.

Under the circumstances it seems there is, in fact, little if any chance that achievement of the 1969 goal is possible since the supplemental request has been cut in half by the Appropriations Committee, all of it from the Apollo project which Mr. Webb told the Congress it could not cut without making the 1969 target date unattainable. Dr. Welsh, in a refreshingly frank statement by a space official, was quoted in the Washington Star recently as saying:

We haven't given this (1969 goal) up yet, but even if we had we wouldn't admit it.

But this minute reduction in the supplemental request puts NASA in a position to blame the Congress for forcing it to give up the target date, since it failed to supply the funds said to be essential to attaining the goal. There is no reason to continue on a crash basis when Congress has already been told, if we piece everything together, that a landing cannot be made in 1969. We are inviting far greater losses of prestige if the Nation fails to meet what has repeatedly been said to be the goal than if we acted like a mature nation and admitted that we erred in setting the goal in the first place. The policies of our Nation will have a far greater impact on the world if we sustain our space program on a more reasonable scale and divert some of the money and talent involved to solving problems here on earth. Power to influence great world events derives from a firmer base than news headlines.

The second point advanced against any cuts in the lunar program is that it will cost more if it is stretched out because of continuing overhead expenses and increased material costs. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] destroyed this argument very effectively in his subcommittee session when he said:

To carry that theory out to its supreme you would never be able to shut anything down temporarily or otherwise or slow up anything.

Senators know quite well that the space program will continue long after we have placed a man on the moon. Our billions invested in permanent physical facilities for the space effort will not be abandoned the moment a lunar landing is accomplished. As a matter of fact, this bill provides $26 million for NASA to use in trying to determine what to do after the lunar landing has been accomplished. Only last month NASA let more than $6.5 million worth of study contracts to aerospace firms to find out, according to a NASA press release:

What manned space programs after Apollo * * * most effectively meet urgent national needs.

This does not look like NASA is planning to go out of business anytime soon. To say that the overhead costs will increase if we delay the lunar program has little validity when we put the space program in proper perspective and think of it as another of the many permanent governmental research activities. We are building for a continuing competence in space—not for a one-shot proposition.

Space officials have assured the Congress that only some $2 billion of the $20 billion for the lunar program are being spent for components peculiar to the lunar landing mission—that the other $18 billion would be spent on space exploration regardless of the moon goal. But Mr. Webb in his testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee stated, and I quote:

If Congress approves the NASA budget request for 1965, the United States will be more than halfway to the moon.

This indicates pretty clearly to me that any objective other than the moon is strictly secondary in NASA's plans. I think that NASA officials would be hard pressed to justify spending $35 billion in space this decade if the moon did not exist. Do Senators really believe that $18 billion would be spent on manned space exploration this decade if there were not a moon in the heavens to stimulate man's adventuresome spirit? Under the circumstances, the $2 billion allocated by NASA as peculiar to the moon project appears somewhat underestimated.

Congress has been told that the cost of the lunar landing will increase by $1 billion for each year the landing is delayed. This is a 50-percent increase—according to the NASA argument—for only a 1-year delay in a $2 billion program. This is ridiculous on the surface. NASA cannot have it both ways—it must either place the lunar landing costs at a realistic level or admit that the estimated cost increase from delays applies to the entire manned space effort.

Eighty-three percent of NASA's budget is slated for research and development. NASA absorbs over one-fourth of all funds allotted for Federal research and development in 1965. We normally think of research and development as being aimed at improvement—at doing jobs better and at a lower cost. Yet NASA has told the Congress that it will cost $6 billion more to reach the moon if we delay the target date until 1975. Apparently, no provision has been made for a payoff from research and development and NASA officials are operating on the assumption that the moonship and related systems in 1975 will be exactly the same as the one planned for 1969. I should hope that in slowing down the moon effort NASA will forgo freezing its spaceship designs and propulsion systems until it gets the results of research and development over the next few years.

If we are spending our research dollars wisely we must certainly expect discovery of new materials, new designs, and new systems which are marked improvements over the present state of the art. Mr. Webb told the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee that there was a "good return on the investment" in the form of new technology but the planning for the lunar program does not indicate any expectation of new knowledge on how to explore space more efficiently. With the inflexible goal of 1969 NASA has boxed itself into a premature freezing of its technology in order to have something that will work quickly. The selection of the design for the vehicle which will land on the moon, the LEM, before sufficient information is obtained as to the character of the moon's surface is a prime example of this haste-inspired approach. If we waited in designing the landing vehicle until we knew more about the lunar surface, after Ranger, Surveyor and the Lunar Orbiter vehicles had done their job, we could build a device to fit the circumstances it will actually encounter. At the present time no one can be sure just what sort of surface the moon will present on a LEM touchdown.

The Apollo project was described by the senior Senator from Missouri during the debate on the authorization bill as a "carefully planned program which has been going well." The facts prove quite the contrary. If the history of past NASA operations is any guide to the future, there is little likelihood that either timing or costs will come close to the target. In the case of Project Mercury, our first manned space flight effort, the plans in early 1959 called for the first orbital flight as early as April 1960. The first flight actually took place in February 1962. The project was originally scheduled for completion in September 1960—the last flight was actually made in May 1963. Congress had been told that the project would cost $200 million. The final official cost estimate was $384 million.

We were told at one time that Project Gemini, the bridge between Mercury and Apollo, would cost about $600 million. By September 1962, NASA said the entire budget for the project stood at $700 million. The hearings before the House Appropriations Committee this year revealed that the total had jumped to $1.22 billion—double the original estimates. According to the 1962 NASA schedule for Gemini, the "two-man flight should begin during the 1963–64 period."

Mr. President, 1963 has come and gone and we are approaching the three-quarter mark in 1964. The first manned flight is now scheduled for the end of this year and some observers believe that it will be early 1965 before it takes place. Senators should keep in mind that NASA has told Congress that 5,000 man-hours of space flight experience will be required before a lunar landing will be attempted. Thus far we have a total of only 54 flight-hours; 1 percent of the flight goal NASA has set for itself.

All Americans have taken great pride in the accomplishment of our astronauts in Project Mercury. Without any doubt Project Gemini will also be a significant milestone in man's exploration of space. But the experience with these two major programs must be used in determining the degree of reliance that can be placed on the assurances Congress has received as to the cost estimates and the timetable for the lunar landing project. Even by giving NASA the benefit of every reasonable doubt the cards are very much stacked against either goal being met.

The success of the seventh Ranger mission was a triumph for our space scientists and engineers. It was a historic occasion and I congratulate all who played a part in the achievement. Man's knowledge of the moon was increased immeasurably by the pictures transmitted by Ranger's cameras. However, Senators must not allow this successful

mission to become their frame of reference for judging the probabilities for achieving the cost and timetable goals for the entire lunar landing program. Ranger is only one relatively small aspect of the program. But our experience with Ranger should be of value in weighing the decision facing the Congress in funding Apollo. Distressing failures rather than resounding successes have been the rule until last Friday in the Ranger program. As the June 16, 1964, report of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, which investigated the project, stated:

The first step in the exploration of the moon is Project Ranger.

In spite of the achievements of *Ranger 7* it has been a very unsteady step—fraught with considerable disappointments. The first Ranger probe was fired on August 26, 1961. On February 2, 1964, *Ranger 6* crashed on the moon after failing to transmit photographs—making a total of six failures out of six shots, adding up to a cost of some $260 million for the project. Several sentences in the House Committee's study report on the Ranger program illustrate quite well the difficulties inherent in pursuing the space program on a crash basis. I quote:

Essential as the instrumented exploration of the moon may be to the Apollo mission, NASA officials readily admit that the timing of the three projects which make up the unmanned program (Ranger, Surveyor, and Lunar Orbiter) is less than optimum, much of the work being done concurrently with the manned program. Design of the Apollo system is well underway, including the most critical part, the Lunar Excursion Module. Should the surface of the moon turn out to be something substantially different from what it is now conceived to be, costly redesign of the LEM might be required.

Information disclosed by *Ranger 7*'s remarkable photographs apparently proved that dust conditions are not as dangerous as some scientists feared but that the surface generally presents formidable physical hazards not expected by others. Even though the photographs are useful in proceeding with development of the Lunar Excursion Module much additional information is required before it can be determined that a manned landing is possible.

Mr. Homer Newell, Director of Space Sciences for NASA, was quoted in the Washington Post as saying in comment on the results of Ranger:

We'll have to wait for Surveyor, a soft-landing JPL spacecraft now being developed by Hughes Aircraft to determine whether the lunar surface is hard enough to permit a manned landing.

We are learning—but we are already several years behind schedule in the learning process. The danger now is not in going too slow but in going too fast and making serious and costly mistakes in trying to make up lost time in the schedule.

NASA is now in a position where the first step leading to a manned lunar landing has failed six out of seven times; the Atlas-Centaur missile to launch Surveyor, the second stage information gathering vehicle, failed to recently in its third attempt, and the Lunar Excursion Module, the design of which is dependent on the information to be gathered by the unmanned flights is already under construction—before we know that the moon's surface will support a manned vehicle. Surely the prospects for success of Apollo within the allotted timetable and cost estimates are somewhat remote if past experience with these essential preliminary programs is a reliable guide. The facts are that under favorable circumstances NASA has not met time and cost schedules on the projects which make up the early phases of the lunar program. There is far less likelihood of attaining either the $20 billion or the 1969 goal for the manned landing at this rate.

In summary, NASA officials have told the Congress that they have a "fighting chance" to put a man on the moon by 1970 if provided with the funds requested by the President, including the $141 million supplemental request. I was advised that the lunar landing would be delayed 6 months if this supplemental was not approved. The Congress is not going to approve this amount because the Senate Committee cut it in half and, due to the parliamentary situation, the amount cannot be increased in conference. Neither Project Mercury nor Project Gemini have met time or cost schedules, leaving little room to hope that the infinitely more complex Project Apollo will stay within the official $20 billion estimate and fulfill its objective by 1970—even if circumstances were reasonably favorable. "What is past is prolog," and the history of major NASA projects furnishes little justification for optimism on meeting the time and cost goals for Project Apollo. Dick Tracy and Diet Smith may be able to make a moon landing via the comic pages with ease, but actual conditions present more complex problems.

In closing, I emphasize again that I am not opposed to the lunar landing program. I question only the pace of the program. Is it more important for us to make a more adequate attack on some of the grave deficiencies of our society or put a man on the moon by 1970? I have heard nothing which indicates that the Nation's security or the welfare of any of our citizens would suffer as a result of reducing the funds for Apollo. A persuasive case can be made that the prospects for passage of programs to improve the habitability of this planet may very well be improved if we abandon the forced pace of the 1970 goal and pursue the program in a more orderly manner.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point articles from the Saturday Evening Post and the Reader's Digest concerning the space program, and an editorial from the August 2 issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Sept. 14, 1963]

ARE WE WASTING BILLIONS IN SPACE?

(By Stuart H. Loory)

Even the midsummer ice floes in Hudson Bay lost their glare for those few moments of total eclipse last July 20 when an Aerobee sounding rocket skittered up and away from Fort Churchill, Canada. Its purpose was to measure quick changes in the upper atmosphere. But after 2 seconds of flight, the rocket's booster blew up in glittering bits of debris—all the more noticeable because of the dull, unworldly eclipse light.

It was disappointment for Dr. William G. Fastie of Johns Hopkins University, whose experiment had come to naught. For the American taxpayers, it was another quarter of a million dollars lost in the space race. There was, however, no great public outcry. That small experiment and the money involved just was not worth arguing about these days when scientists build $100 million Saturn V moon rockets to fly once and then throw away as casually as a housewife discards a used paper napkin.

The Aerobee, though, should not have failed. Its defect, a flaw in the packing of the rubbery solid fuel, could have been discovered simply by X-raying the booster before use.

Why didn't they X-ray this one?

"They didn't have time," said Dr. Fastie. "This was a crash program."

What's true at the rocket research range on the subarctic tundra is also true at Cape Canaveral, Fla.; Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.; Wallops Island, Va., and White Sands, N. Mex. Much of the space effort is a "crash program," a breakneck race to explore and exploit the new medium stretching eternally away from our planet.

Big, blaring, burgeoning in a 100 directions, the space program stands accused today as a monstrous boondoggle—a circus intended just as much to keep American prestige afloat throughout the world as it is to exploit space. However, gains in prestige may be measured, there is widespread doubt that they are worth the cost. A formidable list of people in government, industry, education, and science have indicted the space program in recent months as a woeful waste of taxpayers' money—and of the Nation's most important resource, its skilled manpower.

Former President Eisenhower called the project to land men on the moon a "stunt." Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., board chairman of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the former President's first science adviser, said the program may drain talent away from military and industrial projects of great importance. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania likens the Soviet-American competition in space to a "high-school cross-country race."

Even people with deep professional interest and involvement in space exploration have become critical. Dr. Philip Abelson, geophysicist, editor of the prestigious Science magazine and a consultant to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, told the Senate recently that "manned space exploration has limited scientific value and has been accorded an importance which is quite unrealistic." Prof. Polykarp Kusch, Nobel laureate in physics, told the same committee that "the present space program attempts too much too fast."

More than anything else, critics of the space effort attribute its many difficulties to undue haste—to the "crash program" approach that leads to oversights, duplications and ill-advised shortcuts in the normal procedures of scientific research. "Scientific exploration cannot be frenzied and panicky without great waste," says Dr. Simon Ramo, vice chairman of Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge, Inc., a top aerospace contractor. Doctor Ramo thinks it is "too early" to determine whether NASA's program is "frenzied and panicky." But others are convinced it is high time to start finding out.

The Government's space budget has grown from $347.5 million in 1958—the first year after the Soviets launched Sputnik I—to $7.6 billion during the coming year. It is easy to forget the magnitude of these figures unless you equate them with down-to-earth projects. The $22 million NASA obligated last year to build a control center in Houston was more than the U.S. assessment to the United Nations. Local school boards could have built and equipped 10 high schools with the money NASA used to buy a sand island near Cape Canaveral for a moonport site. Just the quarter of a million thrown away on Doctor Fastie's little rocket could have sent at least a dozen scholars through 4 years at any Ivy League college.

Has the space program gone out of control? If so, why? And if the Nation's spacemen are perpetrating the boldest boondoggle since the construction of the pyramids, how do you pull in the reins?

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, explains why these questions are hard to answer. "Like everything else that grows so fast, there probably is waste in the NASA budget," says CASE. "Like everything else run by ambitious, driving men, there will be duplication. But all we can do is fuss about it. It takes engineers and scientists to really make the judgments. We (Congress) have the rather unattractive job of providing the forum. The terribly troublesome thing is that when an agency has dough like this to throw around, the criticism is going to be inevitably muted."

Neither NASA nor the Kennedy administration has tried to conceal the fact that space exploration would be expensive. James E. Webb, the robust 57-year-old lawyer who is NASA Administrator, insists that "the most effective way of spending the money is worked over by our own people and then by the Bureau of the Budget," subject to "important influences" from outside scientists and congressional committees. NASA's job, he says, is to bring together people with all kinds of diverse interests and objectives in space and coordinate things in a "balanced" space program.

Yet actual control of the program is far more difficult than it might sound. Space contractors have a way of overselling their capabilities in order to get contracts. Scientists tend to oversell their pet research projects. The expanding bureaucracy of the space agency itself creates confusion and inefficiencies. Objective evaluation of these teeming activities, as Senator CASE points out, is muddled by the technical complexity—which makes it hard for laymen to second-guess the scientists—and by the quantities of money involved. In Congress, pork-barreling legislators may overlook—and even encourage—waste as long as they can get fat space contracts for their home States. Informed criticism may be "muted" even on university campuses, where $50 million in annual NASA grants can play hob with academic objectivity.

Each year since World War II, as the Nation has demanded more and more from its scientists, it has delegated more and more decisionmaking authority to them. Congressmen have stood in awe of projects involving buildings as tall as the Washington Monument and half again as large as the Pentagon. When a scientist says he needs a 6-foot thick window to watch radioactive reactions, the lawmaker cannot say no. Who is to gainsay the engineer demanding special barges, barge canals and tractors to move his 2,500-ton rockets?

The lawmakers must become familiar with projects bearing such names as OGO, EGO, POGO, and OSO (orbiting observatories budgeted this year at $194.4 million); Fire and Advanced Fire (to study heating of vehicles coming back to earth from the moon and planets at a cost of $12 million); Tiros and Nimbus (weather forecasting satellites costing $63.7 million); Kiwi, Nerva, Rift, and Rover (various phases of the nuclear-rocket program costing $96.7 million); Centaur, Scout, Delta, and Aerobee (launch vehicles costing $127.7 million); Mariner, Ranger, and Surveyor (moon- and planet-probing spaceships priced at $282.6 million); and, of course, Apollo and Gemini, the project names for the largest scientific undertaking ever mounted—man's assault on the moon. NASA plans to spend no less than $3.7 billion on that project this year alone. And that will be only a small downpayment on the $20 to $40 billion the project will ultimately cost.

NASA has been joined by the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Weather Bureau, and the National Science Foundation in the celestial treasure hunt. The space agency itself has grown from an outfit that builds and launches rockets into one that supports research in diverse fields ranging from the synthesis of life in test tubes to communications between man and other animal species. It has given the University of Manchester in England a grant to study the moon's surface from a station in Japan and it has given the University of Colorado money to study the impact of the space program on the city of Boulder. NASA finances projects only distantly related to space. It made a $92,615 grant to Mississippi State University to study how agrarian states can contribute to the space program and a grant of $400,000 to Columbia University for a study of how to disseminate space news to the public and train science writers. (The latter has since been canceled.)

IS THIS TRIP NECESSARY?

Considering the vast, confusing array of projects, the layman can only ask in his small voice, "Is this trip necessary?"

It is not possible to point to any program in science as an example of abject waste. The scientist always learns, even from his failures. Yet the cost of learning can come high, as illustrated by the case of Project Centaur.

In 1958 General Dynamics Astronautics and Pratt & Whitney made a proposal to the Air Force to build a rocket burning liquid hydrogen, a fuel which would give far more energy per pound than anything else our rockets burn. The industrial team estimated it could fly the first vehicle by January 1961, and then fly one a month after that through June 1961, to make the rocket operational. The original cost for all six shots was estimated at $59 million.

Troubles plagued the program throughout, however. The first flight did not take place until May 8, 1962, at which time Centaur, now a NASA project, blew up after less than 60 seconds of flight.

A subsequent congressional investigation showed that the Centaur slippage played a strong part in forcing the Defense Department to "reorient" its Advent communication satellite, cutting its size drastically and resulting in the utter waste of tens of millions of dollars. (The exact figure is classified.) Similarly investigators found that NASA had wasted $20 million in designs for the Surveyor program, which had to be thrown away because Centaur could not make its projected weightlifting capability. It also wasted $4 million in cutting the weight of last year's Mariner spaceship that flew to Venus (on a different rocket).

The investigators found both NASA and the contractors guilty of poor management. They said General Dynamics allowed fundamental design problems to go undetected. General Dynamics explained that it was using a smaller margin of safety than NASA felt desirable, that it had gambled on this margin and lost because, in one case, it could not weld thin sheets of metal into a bulkhead.

Meanwhile Pratt & Whitney ran into quality-control problems at a plant it had built in West Palm Beach, Fla., and moved the hydrogen-engine assembly line back to its East Hartford, Conn., plant. Since the missed operational date, NASA has spent $275 million in a fundamental redesign of the Centaur rocket.

Today Centaur is 2 years behind schedule; the second test flight still has not taken place. Ironically, its problems illustrate the dangers of unseemly haste. The contractors apparently rushed into the project without adequately assessing their own capacity to handle it—and NASA went along. To save time, NASA pushed other projects dependent on Centaur concurrently with Centaur itself. When Centaur failed to meet expectations, the "shortcut" became a detour.

The Ranger program to land instruments on the moon is in similar shape. As far back as 1958 the United States tried to land something on the moon in a keep-up-with-the-Soviets drive. The Army, Air Force, and industry ran up a string of eight failures in eight attempts to hit or come close to the moon. Then NASA entered Ranger in the competition in 1961 and 1962 and racked up five failures in five attempts—though only three were real efforts to hit the moon and get information home.

A NASA investigation, the details of which were never released, showed that bad management and insufficient quality control contributed to the Ranger failures. Dr. Homer Newell, head of NASA's Office of Space Sciences, hinted that poor design, sloppy fabrication and insufficient testing all played a role.

Another cause of Ranger's failures shows how scientists, in their haste, sometimes work at cross-purposes.

Each Ranger aimed at the moon was sterilized to make certain that the virgin satellite was not contaminated by life from earth before biologists could write the moon's own natural history. But NASA found that the sterilization process, which involved heating, artificially aged the Rangers, contributing to their failures.

Now, future Rangers will not be sterilized (there is probably no life on the moon anyway). Meanwhile, scientists will go back to the laboratory to do research they should already have done before they sterilize any more spacecraft.

Whatever the problems, the designers of the landing vehicles that will take men to the surface of the moon 5 to 7 years hence are pondering their blueprints without the information Ranger was to have provided on the density and regularly of the moon's surface. Scientists have nothing to show for the quarter of a billion Ranger has cost so far.

The problems of Ranger and Centaur could have been avoided if technology were not being pushed to the limit, and if scientists and engineers were paying more attention to time-consuming details. Just as the lack of an X-ray cost Dr. Fastie his once-in-a-lifetime chance to probe the upper atmosphere during an eclipse, a bumble by a computer programer cost the American taxpayers $20 million last year. One scientist made a mistake in supplying an Atlas rocket with a set of automatic steering instructions. In effect, he left a punctuation mark out of a sentence and as a result a Mariner bound for Venus roared off course and had to be destroyed. Additional checking of that work by other men would have caught that mistake.

Project Mercury, our pioneering man-in-space effort, is an example of waste engendered by pushing technology beyond its limits. For example, designers found they could not load enough oxygen into the cramped capsule with conventional oxygen bottles, so they had to design smaller bottles and then devise new welding techniques to make them withstand high pressures. That's

one of the reasons Mercury ran twice its original cost of $200 million and took twice the estimated time to get a man into orbit.

But more importantly, the men running Mercury paid attention to all the details and solved every last foreseen difficulty before committing any astronauts to space flight. That's why each of the flights has been a success.

The Gemini program to place two men into orbit in a single spaceship and teach them how to rendezvous with another spaceship could be another Ranger or Centaur in the making. Representative JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, studious member of the House Committee on Space and Astronautics, and one of the biggest boosters of the space program, does not look kindly on Gemini's progress. "If you really want an example of waste, it's Gemini," FULTON says.

The Gemini spacecraft today—a year behind schedule—bears virtually no relationship to the original proposal by the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. While McDonnell was selected on the basis of its experience with the Mercury project, many critics feel that NASA may have moved too precipitously. "They should have had competitive bidding for that contract and then they might have gotten some better designs," say Representative FULTON.

During the last half of 1962 NASA awarded contracts totaling $826 million to industry, and only $42 million—about 5 percent—worth of these were advertised for open bidding. Another $424 million—51 percent—were awarded after negotiation with one company selected from a small group invited to bid. The rest were awarded to companies without any competition whatsoever.

Besides pressuring NASA to make more use of competitive enterprise—which could produce lower prices as well as better designs—Congress could also tighten up a budget loophole. Ever since it was formed in 1958, NASA has had the authority to "reprogram" huge amounts of money, from budget items already approved by Congress to others that Congress knows nothing about until after NASA has taken action.

The agency claims it submits an austere budget, considered down to the last nickel. Yet it has reprogramed tens of millions of dollars this year from one line in the 5-volume, 14-pound budget to another. Consider the complicated building with the imposing name "Integrated Mission Control Center" now under construction at NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center near the mosquito-infested bayous between Houston and Galveston.

This is the building from which the flights to the moon will be directed in the same way the Mercury flights were directed from the control center at Cape Canaveral. Last year NASA told Congress it planned to refurbish the Mercury center to handle Gemini flights while building the Apollo center in Houston at a more leisurely pace. Congress provided $8 million for preliminary work on the Apollo center. But then NASA changed its mind, decided to move the controllers out of Cape Canaveral and to build a single Gemini-Apollo control center in Houston.

Instead of asking congressional approval for this major change in plans, NASA scraped together $21,956,700 from other parts of the budget to pay for construction of the building and over half the equipment. This year the agency presented Congress with the fait accompli and asked for an additional $8,409,000 to buy final odds and ends of equipment.

As the operational programs soar in cost, administrative expenses do not stand still. The budget for operating NASA headquarters in Washington will jump from $48.2 million this year to $65.5 million next year. Much of this increase covers the salaries of a growing layer of executives and administrators whose number has increased from 1,300 in 1962 to 2,300 proposed for this year.

In its zeal to hire experts, NASA engaged, among others, an N.Y.U. professor to advise it on how to better relationships with the universities. But Dr. George P. Simpson, an administrator who was already looking into agency-university relationships, did not know of the professor working downstairs until a reporter called it to his attention. NASA has even had to rush to miniaturize its redtape to make room for it. The budget for microfilming of records has increased from $1,640 to $158,000 in 2 years.

Up to now, Congressmen have tended to play sugar daddies to the space agency, no matter what its demands. But this year the House Committee on Sciences and Astronautics carefully sliced 8 percent from NASA's $5.7 billion budget request. The committee listened as NASA paraded its key executives into the hearing room. Each witness was primed with a written statement and supported by colorful charts, models, slides, and films. The committeemen posed searching questions and then started picking away at the five yellow volumes.

LAYMEN CAN ARGUE TOO

"Even though we're laymen, maybe we can understand as much as they do," said Representative OLIN E. (TIGER) TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, who heads the Manned-Spaceflight Subcommittee. "The budget started over 18 months ago. It's just an educated guess. Whoever made it up wasn't going to get caught on the short side."

After 5 years of watching NASA change its mind on various projects, TIGER TEAGUE and his colleagues decided they would argue the issues the same way they argue foreign aid, farm policy, and the disposition of rivers and harbors funds. They felt confident enough to cut $259 million from the $3.7 billion manned-spaceflight item alone, including $120 million from Project Apollo.

Representative JOSEPH E. KARTH, Democrat, of Minnesota, took a candid look at the space program after helping make the cuts. "If there is waste, some of the fault lies in Congress," he said. "After the Soviets shot Sputnik I, there was a very extreme desire to get into space. At first we felt NASA wasn't going fast enough. We forgot they hadn't time to cure—like a good cheese. We forgot they needed time to develop a good organizational setup.

"But now we are no longer overawed by the sensationalism of the overall space program. We are now much better able to evaluate each of the programs on a line-by-line basis. This year we have removed things we feel are nonessential."

When Jim Webb, long a favorite of Vice President Lyndon Johnson, saw that the House committeemen really were serious about their go-slow commands, he took his case to Johnson's territory on the other side of Capitol Hill—to the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. After a brief effort to get Webb to suggest cuts in his own budget, the Senators settled into a discussion of the pork-barrel features and forgot the high-flown national goals. Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, irked by the $21 million "reprogramed" into Texas for that mission-control center, spent the better part of a morning extracting a line-by-line explanation of precisely how the agency planned to spend $312,855,000 in Florida.

"I want a clear picture of what you plan to do in Florida next year," he demanded of Webb. A wag at the press table penned a quick sketch of a barrel-shaped satellite circling the earth and labeled "Orbiting Pork Barrel."

But the committeemen pushed ahead unabashed. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, for example, made a "formal request for what you plan in New York."

Pork-barreling became intimately associated with NASA operations back in 1961 when the agency picked Houston as the site of the Manned Spacecraft Center. Representative ALBERT THOMAS, of Houston, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee that considers NASA's budget, reportedly let it be known that the center must be situated where it would benefit his Eighth Congressional District or NASA would get no money for it.

This year, the big pork-barrel issue was the $56 million electronics research center the space agency wants to build in the Boston area. The center was widely viewed as an aid to the President's brother, Senator EDWARD M. (TEDDY) KENNEDY, in redeeming his campaign promise to "do more" for Massachusetts.

The House committee took 600 pages of testimony on this and gave it only limited approval. While the space budget debate dissolved into questions of spreading the wealth, Jim Webb worked the telephone and the halls of Senate office buildings. In the end he succeeded in having over half of the House cuts restored.

Despite the leadership of the House committee, many lawmakers were still timid when asked to judge big science. Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, allowed that none but "very advanced scientists" could understand the budget, which Congressmen must accept "on faith."

Yet the fact is that every voter, like every legislator, has the right and competence to express an opinion about the space program—not only because he is paying for it but because the pace of the program is directly related to national goals. In 1961, after the Soviets had placed the first man in orbit, President Kennedy challenged Russia to a race to the moon. His challenge came after a small group of men in Government decided that such a race was one we stood a reasonably good chance of winning and one that would give our national prestige an uplift. Caught up in the emotion of the moment, Congress approved the idea unanimously, paying little attention to the price tag.

Now men inside and outside Government are having second thoughts, and these may yet be translated into stiff budget cuts in the days ahead. Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, Republican, of Washington, a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, took the floor during the debate on the space budget and cited a number of scientists who had questioned the value of the moon project.

Among them was Dr. Polykarp Kusch, who measures the program against such national needs as slum clearance; stopping the pollution of our streams and atmosphere; finding cures and preventatives for mental and physical diseases, and searching out scientific mysteries on our own planet. Against these needs he finds the project to allow two men to bathe in lunar dust somewhat frivolous.

NASA's leaders are befuddled by such criticism. They reply that the money diverted from space would not necessarily go into new housing or a cure for schizophrenia. They do not try to justify their program on purely scientific grounds. They admit they are running a race for space supremacy and that the race is intimately bound up in international politics.

"You should see how much we have to keep attuned to the State Department," declares one NASA official. He says that President Kennedy considers NASA part of a triumvirate with the Pentagon and State which, in some not-quite-tangible way, protects security.

NASA Chief Jim Webb believes John Glenn's flight "made the Russians change their mind about Cuba, because we took on the image of a 'can do' nation." The Apollo project, he thinks, will not only help military missile development and produce a lot of scientific information, but will impress the "many, many nations around the world who are so weak they can't afford to be with anyone but a winner and who are looking awfully hard to find a winner."

Surveys abroad by the U.S. Information Agency reportedly show a tremendous interest in the American space program. Yet many have begun to question the propagandistic value, feeling the world is getting a little bored with space flights. They wonder, too, whether the scientific information and defense byproducts couldn't be purchased more cheaply.

Above all, they do not accept the thesis that the answers to such important policy questions should be accepted "on faith." They feel the American people and their lawmakers should make the decisions, and should decide after a calm, complete debate, not in the heat of the moment with astronauts and cosmonauts whirling overhead. That kind of decision has never really been made.

[From Reader's Digest, July 1964]

HOW HASTE IN SPACE MAKES WASTE

(By Joe Alex Morris)

The U.S. space program has two faces, and—like the Moon at which much of it is aimed—one face is familiar to everybody; the other is largely unknown.

The widely publicized face represents great scientific and technological achievement, with potential benefits of vast importance to our future welfare and security. With the successful orbiting of almost 60 scientific and military payloads in 1963 (compared with 17 for the Russians), some of this potential is beginning to be realized.

Unhappily, the space program's little-known face reflects the swiftest mushrooming of a bureaucratic empire in history, with an unprecedented potential for waste, blunders, mismanagement, selfish political pressures and outrageous pork-barrel grabs of the taxpayers' dollars. Some of this deplorable potential has been realized, and a great many thoughtful people, both in and out of Government, are beginning to ask some searching questions about our long-range space spending.

For example: Is so much headlong and extravagant speed in our nonmilitary space effort setting a disastrously expensive precedent for future interplanetary exploration? Will we find that the possible propaganda benefits of beating the Russians to the Moon are not worth all the mistakes and confusion, the wasted billions, which inevitably attend a high-pressure program of this magnitude? Can we continue such a costly pace (studies now are being made for a possible manned flight to Mars in 1973) without courting national bankruptcy?

In the almost 6 years of its existence, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has spent about $12.6 billion, six times the cost of the wartime Manhattan project, which produced the atomic bomb. At its present rate of expenditure—about $5.3 billion a year—total appropriations will have topped $44 billion by the time of the Moon launching, if it comes, in 1970. This adds up to about $30 a year for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

BIGGER THAN ALL OUTDOORS

Everything about NASA's program is so huge that it almost defies comprehension. Whole new industrial complexes have sprung up in answer to its demands, and new housing facilities for its people spread across the landscape.

Brevard County in east central Florida, where Cape Kennedy is located, is typical. Its population jumped from 23,652 in 1950 to 153,000 in 1963, and is expected to climb to at least 250,000 by 1970. Now the older installations on Cape Kennedy are inadequate for the enormous Saturn V moon vehicle which will stand 362 feet high, develop a thrust of 7,500,000 pounds and cost $100 million apiece. Consequently, NASA purchased a new 88,000-acre launching site on nearby Merritt Island at about $200 an acre. Here it is constructing—for an estimated $750 million—a complex of 50 buildings and pads, 17 miles of railroad, a four-lane causeway, a bank, hospital, police and fire stations, and a heliport.

The key item in this installation is an unbelievable Vertical Assembly Building. It will cost $100 million, and will be taller than any structure south of the Washington Monument, and larger in cubic volume than the Pentagon. To provide a solid foundation for the building, it was necessary to drive over 4,000 steel pipes 160 feet down to limerock. Total cost of the foundation: $8 million.

The Florida space complex is only one of a dozen major NASA installations and numerous secondary facilities—such as the Marshall Space Flight Center in Alabama, the Ames Research Center in California, the Michoud plant on the outskirts of New Orleans, a new testing area in Hancock County, Miss., and the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston. Nobody can estimate accurately what percentage of NASA's huge expenditures—especially those for research and development—is wasted. In anything as new as space exploration there are bound to be some errors and false starts. Yet evidence is mounting, month by month, that speed and the bungling which it breeds have resulted in flagrant and needless waste.

MISCALCULATED RISKS

For example, a mistake in specifying the permissible weight of the Surveyor spacecraft designed to orbit the moon made it necessary to redesign the craft completely, increasing the cost by $20 million.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) estimated in 1963 that bungling by NASA and private industry cost taxpayers $100 million in the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle development program. Management of this project (since reorganized) was described as "less than adequate." To cite only one error, the first Centaur vehicle blew up 54 seconds after its launching in May 1962—a failure which should have been foreseen and avoided, a board of inquiry found, because data available 20 months earlier indicated that the Centaur weather shield was not designed to withstand the pressure it would meet.

NASA's 1962 probe of the planet Venus was officially hailed as highly successful. Take a look, however, at the history.

In 1960 it was decided to launch an 1100-pound Mariner spacecraft atop an Atlas-Centaur booster in the summer of 1962, to reach Venus when the planet would be in the most favorable position in relation to the Earth. The craft would carry 16 instruments to report on conditions on and around Venus. It soon became apparent, however, that the Atlas-Centaur would not be ready in time. The target date could have been delayed 19 months until Venus was again in a favorable position. Instead, NASA had the Mariner re-designed—at a cost of $4 million.

The new version, weighing only 447 pounds, was launched late in July 1962 atop an Atlas-Agena B rocket. But because of an error in the programing of automatic steering instructions, the rocket went haywire and had to be destroyed. Cost: $20 million. Then, on August 27, Mariner II was launched. It subsequently passed within 21,000 miles of Venus.

This in itself was a notable technological achievement. "But it was more of a stunt than a contribution to science," a noted scientist said recently. "When the size of the Mariner was reduced by more than half, 8 of the 16 scientific instruments aboard had to be dumped. As a result, the spacecraft was not properly equipped. The project added virtually nothing to our knowledge of the planet. The NASA people were in too big a hurry."

CART BEFORE THE HORSE

Lax management may have been a major cause of waste in Project Ranger. This project is under the technical direction of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena through a million-dollar-a-year NASA contract with the California Institute of Technology. In the Ranger program, which so far has cost some $250 million, there have been six failures in six attempts to make closeup photographs of the moon. NASA officials investigating the failures reported that the laboratory had resisted proposed changes to improve reliability of the spacecraft, and had followed a "shoot and hope" policy in its testing.

Some of NASA's major problems have arisen from the fact that research and development have been conducted concurrently instead of making sure, as one Congressman put it, that "the scientific homework is completed before trying to build something." In other words, the desire for speed has tended to get the cart before the horse.

Consider Project Rover, an attempt to produce a nuclear-powered rocket for deep space travel—which so far has cost NASA and the Atomic Energy Commission about $450 million. In the hope of completing the project sometimes in the 1970's, work had been proceeding on three stages of development simultaneously: testing prototype reactors on the ground, design and construction of a nuclear rocket and reactor-in-flight tests. But the first stage of ground testing last year was an outstanding failure, largely because of insufficient research. The whole program had to be rearranged, and Rover's schedule is now highly uncertain. Nobody can say accurately how much of the original $450 million was wasted by the attempted speedup.

THE MONEY MOON

A vivid inside view of the fantastic and wasteful costs involved in any vast crash program is provided by the early history of Project Apollo—the attempt to place men on the moon. When the moon trip was first discussed, NASA's Administrator, James E. Webb, and his top assistant ordered a detailed study of what would be required and what it would cost. They found that thousands of different elements were needed, from huge launch pads to space suits to wear on the moon. The total tab was about $12.5 billion.

But experience told them they didn't yet have the correct figure. So Webb added an "administrator's markup" of about 60 percent. That brought the total to $20 billion, which President Kennedy then announced as the estimated cost of Project Apollo.

The record demonstrates, however, that NASA cost estimates—even after arbitrary markup—suffer from a powerful tendency toward escalation. Costs of given projects often double or triple before completion. Project Mercury for manned orbit of the earth began as a $200-million program but ended up costing almost $400 million. Project Gemini to put two men in orbit was first estimated at $500 million, but the program has expanded rapidly and will top a billion. The Manned Spacecraft Center in Texas rapidly grew from an original $60 million estimate to a $250 million installation. Most experts now believe that the price tag for placing men on the moon will double—that NASA will have spent some $40 billion on Apollo by 1970.

In the end Project Apollo itself could turn out to be the greatest waste. Many authorities believe it is highly unlikely that man can reach the moon in this decade. As yet, we haven't even been able to land instruments to determine what is on the surface of the moon. Recent discoveries raise a question whether the danger of radiation from solar flares may be far greater for moon voyagers than previously believed. And there are many other stubborn problems yet to be solved.

Even assuming eventual success, enormous waste was built into Project Apollo by turning it for propaganda reasons into a crash program. The political decision to put men on the moon by 1970 was made hurriedly—"over a weekend," one NASA scientist remarked caustically—and at a time when even the ablest scientists could not foresee the magnitude of the task. The decision meant that, instead of developing space capability step by step, the project was vastly speeded up to keep Apollo on schedule at any cost.

COST-PLUS

Further waste was built into our space program because, in the past, most NASA research-and-development projects have been on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. The fee or profit is fixed in advance, but the contractor's cost are paid as they accrue. In some cases, of course—especially in research and development, where costs may be unknowable in advance—this system is essential. But its defect is that contractors, knowing they will be repaid anyway, sometimes grow careless about how much they spend.

Only in recent months has NASA begun to exert better control—through incentive contracts—over spending of contractors. Since some of the spiraling costs come about because NASA changes objectives as a program progresses, aims should be more accurately determined before the contracts are let.

WHO'S RESPONSIBLE?

It would be easy but unreasonable to place all the blame for waste in our space program on NASA's management. To be sure, the agency has demonstrated an uninhibited ability to spend money, but it also has been asked to perform a near miracle in getting the United States to the top fast in space capability. Haste, as usual, has made waste, and the responsibility rests primarily upon the administration and Congress.

Administrator Webb insists that, after several reorganizations during the past 2 years, the agency has been brought under efficient control and "the right people have been put in the right spots." One can hope that this is true. One can also hope that, as we move to other projects even more daring and difficult, Congress will remember Webb's statement: "Our space program has a brake as well as a throttle. We can and will operate on whatever money Congress comes up with."

Right there, of course, lies the crux of the problem. It is not easy to apply the brake. The States and communities that now benefit hugely from NASA spending also exert powerful pressure to keep the golden stream of dollars flowing, while the States that have been left out clamer for their share. This leads to political deals—and to a skyborne pork barrel, which already has become a powerful factor in economic life here on earth.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 2, 1964]

TRIUMPH FOR "RANGER 7"

Publication of the first sample of lunar pictures taken by *Ranger* 7 confirms with extraordinary force that this rocket's flight has been one of the most successful and productive experiments in scientific history. The exquisite clarity of the close-ups of the moon's surface transmitted to earth assure that this event will be recorded as the real beginning of serious human exploration of the moon from the neighborhood of that satellite.

The full exploitation and analysis of new information will take several years, but even the first preliminary study has cleared up major problems and dispelled previous ignorance on important matters. The principal conclusion, of course, is that much of the lunar surface is smooth enough to be suitable for safe landing on it of manned vehicles. Areas of extreme roughness, with numerous medium-sized and small craters previously unknown, have also been found, alerting Project Apollo planners to the importance of avoiding such regions. The fears reputable scientists had expressed earlier about the possibility that the moon was covered with a thick layer of dust, in which vehicles or men landing there might be buried, have been shown to be baseless.

The conception behind *Ranger* 7's flight has proved sound, and there is every reason for confidence that more such flights will greatly extend man's knowledge of lunar geography and topography. They should also help answer many questions about the forces that have shaped this satellite and its weird surface. Clearly, enormous amounts of information about the moon can be gathered by unmanned rockets, like *Ranger* 7, carrying cameras and other instruments.

As President Johnson indicated yesterday, the day is not distant when it will be possible to land men on the moon. But it is now plainer than ever that there is no great scientific necessity for racing to achieve this goal and thus vastly increasing the price in money and human peril. The potentiality for obtaining so much more information relatively cheaply from unmanned, instrument-carrying rockets strengthens the case for abandoning the arbitrary 1970 deadline for Project Apollo and substituting a schedule permitting orderly progress toward a manned voyage to the moon without hazards or costs dictated only by the desire to achive this objective under maximum draft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 69, as follows:

[No. 518 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Burdick	Gruening	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Robertson
Church	Miller	Scott
Cooper	Morse	Simpson
Cotton	Nelson	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Pell	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Prouty	

NAYS—69

Aiken	Hill	Monroney
Allott	Holland	Morton
Bartlett	Hruska	Moss
Bayh	Humphrey	Mundt
Beall	Inouye	Muskie
Bennett	Jackson	Neuberger
Bible	Javits	Pastore
Boggs	Johnston	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Case	Keating	Russell
Curtis	Kuchel	Salinger
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Dodd	Long, La.	Smathers
Dominick	Magnuson	Smith
Eastland	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarthy	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Symington
Fong	McGee	Thurmond
Gore	McIntyre	Tower
Hart	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Mechem	Yarborough
Hickenlooper	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Edmondson	McGovern
Brewster	Goldwater	Talmadge
Cannon	Hayden	Walters
Clark	Kennedy	

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, so that I may interrogate the distingished majority leader?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what remains for the rest of the day; and I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin whether he contemplates asking for a record vote on his other amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I expect to have no further record votes on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be the anticipation of the leadership at the conclusion of the consideration of the pending bill the Senate would stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Based upon the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, we may be able to consider the passage of the pending bill by a voice vote.

The purpose of having the Senate convene at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow would be to give certain committees a chance to meet and to catch up with proposed legislation that is pending before them.

I would hope—and I invite the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, if I may have it—that the Senate would be able to proceed to the consideration of the public works appropriation bill on Friday of this week.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to move tomorrow that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the SEC bill. The House exempted some insurance companies. It is more important to pass the bill than to insist on our bill.

Also, I hope the majority leader will permit the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to call up a little bill that will enable a Baptist church, located at a historic place where one of the relatives of George Washington lived, to buy 3 acres of land at full market value, in order that some of the military personnel and others may attend services there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The SEC conference report will be called up tomorrow, if that answer will satisfy the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to yield a few minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for the purpose already expounded by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader about the resolution with respect to the unpleasantness in southeast Asia. It is likely to be reported by the committees tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If it is reported, it will be taken up tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SALE OF PROPERTY TO WOODLAND BAPTIST CHURCH, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia such time as he may need.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 11064.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The bill (H.R. 11064) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States, situated in the State of Virginia, was read twice by its title.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the bill provides for the sale of property to the Woodland Baptist Church, Fairfax County, Va., at full value as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 11064) was considered, ordered to a third reading, and passed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1169. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike out "$4,855,000" and insert "$4,285,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "$600,000" and insert "$250,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike out "$950,000" and insert "$880,000".

On page 4, line 19, strike out "$85,000,000" and insert "$70,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike out "$69,200,000" and insert "$19,200,000".

On page 6, lines 11–12, strike out "$9,250,000" and insert "$8,500,000".

On page 6, line 23, strike out "$10,775,000" and insert "$10,440,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike out "$86,124,000" and insert "$79,000,000".

On page 8, line 1, strike out "$22,187,000" and insert "$21,805,000".

On page 11, line 5, strike out "$277,000" and insert "$270,000".

On page 12, line 3, strike out "sixteen" and insert "twelve".

On page 12, line 4, strike out "twelve" and insert "eight".

On page 12, line 5, strike out "$544,100,000" and insert "$537,600,000".

On page 12, line 9, strike out "$6,344,000" and insert "$6,000,000".

On page 12, line 10, strike out "406" and insert "396".

On page 12, line 25, strike out "$66,000,000" insert "$50,000,000".

On page 14, line 9, strike out "$42,000,000" and insert "$21,000,000".

On page 14, line 16, strike out "$3,600,000" and insert "$3,530,000".

On page 15, line 4, strike out "$1,800,000" and insert "$1,620,000".

On page 16, line 19, strike out "$16,460,000" and insert "$16,310,000".

On page 17, lines 1–2, strike out "$12,699,000" and insert "$12,180,000".

On page 17, line 10, strike out "$13,025,000" and insert "$12,725,000".

On page 18, line 4, strike out "$224,570,000" and insert "$213,800,000".

On page 19, line 23, strike out "$161,247,500" and insert "$151,722,000".

On page 35, line 7, strike out "$52,420,000" and insert "$48,920,000".

On page 35, line 22, strike out "$15,155,000" and insert "$14,955,000".

On page 36, line 11, strike out "$5,765,000" and insert "$5,465,000".

On page 37, line 4, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,875,000".

On page 38, line 14, strike out "$1,530,000" and insert "$1,505,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike out "$21,840,000" and insert "$19,565,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike out "$15,925,000" and insert "$15,525,000".

On page 43, line 12, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,250,000".

On page 44, line 21, strike out "$50,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike out "$16,084,000" and insert "$15,484,000".

On page 46, line 7, strike out "thirty-eight" and insert "thirty-six".

On page 46, line 8, strike out "$25,710,000" and insert "$25,260,000".

On page 47, line 4, strike out "$4,413,494,000" and insert "$4,313,594,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike out "$155,250,000" and insert "$155,000,000".

On page 52, line 8, strike out "$14,500,000" and insert "$14,200,000".

On page 52, line 13, strike out "$38,000,000 of which $1,275,000" and insert "$36,000,000 of which $1,170,000".

On page 54, line 12, strike out "$39,600,000" and insert "$34,600,000".

On page 55, line 1, strike out "$98,733,000" and insert "$91,233,000".

On page 65, line 22, strike out "$10,375,000" and insert "$9,000,000".

On page 66, line 6, strike out "$78,750,000" and insert "$75,000,000".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT BY SENATOR DODD OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION ON VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the immediate retaliatory action ordered by President Johnson against the North Vietnamese gunboats which had attacked our destroyers on the high seas and against their supporting facilities in North Vietnam will, I am certain, be approved by the overwhelming majority of the American people and by their Representatives in Congress.

President Johnson has made it clear that our response was limited, that we have no intention of spreading the conflict, but that our Government is prepared to take whatever measures may be necessary in order to defend the freedom of the seas and the freedom of southeast Asia.

I believe that President Johnson's prompt and decisive action is a blow for freedom and a blow for peace.

The Asian Communists for many years now have been assiduously spreading the story that the United States is a "paper tiger." They have been telling people in southeast Asia that all of the administration's actions on South Vietnam and all of its statements reconfirming our commitment to the freedom of the area, are just so much bluff because the administration's hands would be tied by the forthcoming election campaign.

Perhaps they really believed their own propaganda. Perhaps they believed that there would be no retaliation if they staged this attack on American vessels on the high seas, 65 miles distant from their own coastline. Perhaps they

planned to further humiliate us in this way, and thus prove to their own people and to the other peoples of Asia that the United States is indeed no more than a "paper tiger." This, as I see it, is the only plausible explanation for what would otherwise appear to be an insane act of recklessness.

President Johnson's decisive action and the immediate support it has received from leaders of both political parties should suffice to persuade the North Vietnamese Communist leaders and their masters in Peiping that the differences which separate Republicans and Democrats and the current domestic emphasis on campaign politics do not in any way affect the essential unity of our Nation, nor do they reduce the ability of the administration to respond to open Communist aggression.

The President's action has, in short, given the lie to the Communist propaganda that our statements about South Vietnam are bluff and that the United States in a preelection period is incapable of acting decisively.

History teaches us that the failure to respond to one act of aggression inevitably begets further acts of aggression; that weakness and appeasement make the peace of the world less secure, not more secure, because they encourage the aggressors to believe that they can get away with it. It is this lesson that President Johnson was referring to when he said:

> Firmness in the right is indispensable today for peace. That firmness will always be measured. Its mission is peace.

I hope that Congress will move immediately to record its support for the action taken by President Johnson.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment reduces the total appropriations recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee for Independent offices by $293,899,050. Amendment No. 1169 accomplishes this by reducing Senate Appropriation Committee recommendations to the House level. The House appropriated $8,091,698,000 for independent offices, and in addition the House Appropriations Committee recommended an expenditure of $5,200 million for our space program, which was knocked out by a point of order on the House floor because NASA funds had not yet been authorized. Thus, in the normal course of events, the House figure would probably have been $13,291,698,000. This represents a House increase over fiscal 1964 of $49,097,450.

The Senate Appropriations Committee increase over the House figure represents a whopping $342,997,500 increase over fiscal 1964. Thus, the Senate increase over last year is almost seven times as great as the House increase.

Mr. President, in January of this year, President Lyndon Johnson pledged a "reduction in Federal expenditures and Federal employment." He then went on to say "by curtailing less urgent programs. I am able to recommend in this reduced budget the most Federal support in history for education, for health, for retraining the unemployed, and for helping the economically and the physically handicapped." But does the independent offices increase recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee mean an increase in those areas of social concern the President referred to in his budget message? Does it mean an increase in education, health, retraining of the unemployed, for helping the economically and physically handicapped? The answer must be a resounding "No."

The bulk of this budget increase simply means more money for two very, very fat cats—the Federal Aviation Agency and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Federal Aviation Agency, of which I shall have more to say when I discuss my amendment No. 1171, would get $60,657,500 more than they got last year. My amendment would knock out $43,750,000 of this amount by reducing the increase to that approved by the House. NASA would get a fantastic $200 million more than they received last year, should the Appropriations Committee figure be approved. Here again, my amendment would cut this figure down to the amount that would in all probability have been approved by the House had not a point of order been raised. This represents a decrease of $100 million.

The third substantial cut made by my amendment is in the civil defense agency's budget. The House cut more than $22 million from last year's appropriations. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommends an increase over last year of $42,631,000. This is $65 million over the House-approved figure. Again, my amendment would eliminate the $65 million increase. The bulk of this figure would go for shelter survey and marking. The House report felt that the great amount requested should not be approved because "the entire fallout shelter program is under study and review."

Consequently, the three biggest cutbacks my amendment makes—in NASA FAA, and civil defense—amount to $208,750,000, more than two-thirds of the total amount my amendment would save. Surely, these funds should be cut, if we use President Johnson's criterion of social utility in evaluating budget requests.

Finally, I would stress again, as I have so often before, that to increase Federal expenditures in a year of reduced taxes, and thus to accentuate our budget deficit, is irresponsible. We are not keeping faith with the American taxpayer. This is especially so, when no social ills are attacked by the increases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table explaining the amendment in greater detail be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

AMENDMENT TO KNOCK TOTAL DOWN TO HOUSE FIGURE

The House appropriated $8,091,698,000. In addition to this, the House Appropriations Committee recommended $5,200 million for NASA which was knocked out on a point of order because these funds had not yet been authorized. Thus, in the normal course of events, the House figure would probably have been $13,291,698,000:

House figure	$8,091,698,000
House recommendation for NASA	5,200,000,000
House total	13,291,698,000

The Senate committee recommended $13,585,597,050, an increase of $293,899,050 over the House total:

Senate recommendation	$13,585,597,050
House total	13,291,698,000
Senate increase	293,899,050

This amendment would reduce the total appropriation by $293,899,050 from $13,585,597,050 to $13,291,698,050.

The budget request was for $14,221,511,400. The House version cuts $929,813,400 off this while the Senate cuts only $635,914,350:

Budget request	$14,221,511,400
House version	13,291,698,000
House cuts	929,813,400
Budget request	14,221,511,400
Senate version	13,585,597,050
Senate cuts	635,914,350

The fiscal year 1964 appropriations totaled $13,242,600,550. Thus the House would increase this for fiscal year 1965 by $49,097,450, while the Senate would make a whopping $342,997,500 increase over fiscal year 1964:

House version	$13,291,698,000
Fiscal year 1964 appropriations	13,242,600,550
House increase over fiscal year 1964	49,097,450
Senate version	13,585,597,050
Fiscal year 1964 appropriations	13,242,600,550
Senate increase over fiscal year 1964	342,997,500

Thus the Senate increase over last year is almost seven times as great as the House increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. The amendment would reduce from $42 million to $21 million the appropriations for Federal Aviation Agency research and development.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will accept the recommendation of our Appropriations Committee and approve the full amount requested by the administration for Federal Aviation Agency research and development. I was surprised to learn that the $42 million requested for

FAA research will be—if it is approved—almost all that is being spent in the entire country on the effort to improve air safety.

The main challenge facing aeronautical science today is making air travel safer. During 1963, 896 persons were killed in nonmilitary airplane accidents in this country. The worldwide fatality rate, approximately 11 deaths per billion passenger miles flown, has not been reduced at all during the last 10 years.

Yet, commercial aviation is a rapidly expanding industry throughout the world. If air traffic continues to increase and there is no reason to believe it will not, we shall be averaging one major air disaster every day by the end of the 1980's, unless the fatality rate can be reduced. This could mean as many as 15,000 persons killed every year.

I see no reason why we have to accept a situation like this when, by continuing and expanding research projects already undertaken by air safety experts, we have a good chance to make significant advances in the reduction of flight hazards.

The National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center, near Atlantic City, N.J.—NAFEC—is one of this Nation's No. 1 research resources. Yet, if the House-approved appropriation for FAA research were approved, 25 to 30 percent of the Center's 1,300-man work force might be laid off, and half or more of the research projects now underway would have to be dropped.

Mr. President, I submit that this is the most false and dangerous kind of economy, and I strongly urge approval of the Senate Appropriations Committee recommendation of $42 million for FAA research and development.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief description of NAFEC projects, prepared at my request by Mr. Joseph Blatt, Research Director for the Federal Aviation Agency, be printed in the RECORD. This statement will show, in somewhat more technical terms, what the House action would mean to air safety research, and all who travel by air, if it were allowed to stand.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The House action, cutting the budget request made by the President for the Federal Aviation Agency's Research and Development appropriation by 50 percent will seriously disrupt the Agency's efforts to make significant improvements in the National Airspace System in the next few years. Specifically:

1. The proposed budget contemplated $18.1 million for the development, test, and evaluation of components, systems, and procedures for the control of enroute and terminal air traffic. The primary effort under the budget plan was to develop the equipment and procedures for the first phase of a semi-automated system during fiscal year 1965. Current fiscal year funds have been utilized to order the development of a significant portion of the engineering model equipment to be delivered to the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center. The proposed reduction will force the Agency to defer the purchasing of the additional equipment required for the completion of the model. This will result in reduced effort at NAFEC and the delay of improvements in the field environment until adequate funds are provided in a future year to complete the developmental effort.

2. One of the most important research and development efforts of the Agency has been the progressive development of components to lower the permissive meteorological minima for approach and landing and ultimately develop an all-weather landing capability. The major emphasis in fiscal year 1965 was the development and implementation at NAFEC of an integrated all-weather final approach flareout and landing system with all-weather takeoff minima. Under the proposed reduction we will have to limit our efforts to the so-called category II (100-foot ceiling and one-quarter mile visibility) effort; thus denying aviation the degree of reliability; and safety under all-weather conditions that the state-of-the-art could provide.

3. The radical reduction in funds will force the Agency to reappraise its decision with respect to future programs at NAFEC. As a minimum a significant reduction must be made in the personnel working on research and development projects at Atlantic City. It is estimated that this reduction in personnel will be extremely destructive of the capability that has been developed at Atlantic City over the past 5 years. It will constitute a threat to our personnel and a serious deterrent to the reduction of the most competent personnel now on hand at NAFEC who form the nucleus of a most valuable national asset.

4. At NAFEC a portion of our effort is devoted toward applied research which involves looking at advances in the state-of-the-art and investigations looking toward the resolution of problems in the national airspace. The proposed reduction will force the Agency to eliminate this type of activity and to disband the organization we have created to work in this area.

5. The reduction will cause the Agency to completely eliminate such investigations as the utilization of very low-frequency techniques for the resolution of long-distance transoceanic and transcontinental navigation problems and airborne collision prevention systems.

6. Work in improvement in aircraft lighting and design, improved communications, improved weather data presentation equipment, improvements to our radar acquisition system, and the development of improvements in flight inspection equipment will be seriously curtailed at NAFEC.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I urge a resounding "no" vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

FLIGHT SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on January 31, 1964, the Federal Aviation Agency announced that it intended to consolidate 42 flight service stations throughout this country in the interest of economy. Three of the flight service stations to be closed are located in Elmira, Poughkeepsie, and Utica, N.Y. The FAA's proposed action, consequently, has been a matter of vital importance and concern both to the communities affected and to New York State as a whole.

The problem of the consolidation of the flight service stations has been the subject of careful study by the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which held hearings on this subject on May 12, 1964. The report of the subcommittee is expected to be filed in the near future. The subject was also considered on the floor of the House on May 21, 1964, during debate on the independent offices appropriations bill. At that time, the House adopted an amendment to continue operations of certain flight service stations until the end of the fiscal year. Regrettably, the Senate Appropriations Committee did not include this amendment in the bill which it reported July 30, 1964. However, there are assurances which the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency gave in his letter to me of January 31, 1964, that the program of consolidation would be carried out during the next 12 to 24 months; therefore, not until, at the earliest, next February.

The Administrator testified before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, at page 1475 of the record of hearings that the FAA had abandoned the scheme to close down the flight service stations, although it might reduce 24-hour service of the stations to somewhere between 8- and 16-hour service. Moreover, in a letter from the Federal Aviation Agency to Representative ROBERT DOLE, dated March 24, 1964, printed in the record of debate by the House on this appropriatiion bill, Assistant FAA Administrator William J. Schulte stated that:

I want to reconfirm the fact that the consolidation is not planned to take place for 12 to 24 months.

It is also clear from the record of the House debate that the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee understood that no consolidation would take place for at least 12 months. Based on this record, it seems quite clear that the FAA will not close any of the flight service stations until very careful consideration has been given to all alternatives consistent with full flight safety at the individual airports.

The FAA has estimated that the consolidation of the 42 flight service stations would bring about substantial savings. They have estimated that the savings in consolidating the Elmira, Poughkeepsie, and Utica, N.Y., flight service stations would amount to $171,000. I should like to make clear that I have always supported and will continue to support efforts by Federal agencies to achieve meaningful savings of Federal funds. The prudent and economical use of our Government's funds is an objective worthy of our best efforts. I do believe, however, that the Federal agency which proposes economy measures must bear the burden of proof that true and meaningful savings will be accomplished without loss of necessary and vital services to our citizens.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have asked the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare an analysis of the savings to be

obtained by the consolidation of flight service stations in New York State. This report is presently being worked on.

In view of the representation of the Federal Aviation Agency that a careful study of consolidation plans will be made before any action is taken, I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will give careful continued consideration to the actions of the FAA with respect to consolidation of these stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the most recent status report prepared by the Federal Aviation Agency on the flight service stations program.

There being no objection, the status report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS REPORT ON THE FLIGHT SERVICE STATION PROGRAM

The Federal Aviation Agency will test various plans for providing communications and flight assistance services to pilots from more airport locations at less cost during the next year. In the early days of aviation, one of the first services provided to pilots was collecting weather and landing area information through teletypewriter networks and communicating the information to both pilots in the air and to pilots prior to takeoff. Initially, ground personnel was placed at every location where a transmitter was needed as this was then the simplest way of providing required air-ground communications. In recent years, it has become more economical and more efficient to net several remote transmitters into one central manned ground facility and provide the same air-ground communications coverage with less personnel. As a result, the number of flight service stations has been reduced gradually over the years. These stations now could be reduced to a small fraction of the present number and provide present air-ground communications coverage. However, there remains a need to have personnel at certain airports to provide current weather and landing information during the busier hours. Thus, there needs to be a balance between the economy of centralizing communications services and the need for human observers at many airports.

To achieve this balance, the FAA has developed a plan which will permit it to reduce the number of stations which are now manned around the clock and at the same time expand the service to other airports during the busy hours to provide a better service designed to meet actual modern day aviation requirements. To be certain that the plan, as developed, does in fact meet the needs of the aviation public, tests will be conducted at various locations in the United States to determine the best balance between necessary service and the most economical operation. Representative locations will be selected to test the various methods of providing services.

The Administrator presented the plan in some detail to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives.

The study that developed the plan demonstrated that the Agency needed better distribution of the flight service station resources to effect operating economies and to serve the growing needs of general aviation. The present FSS network in the 48 conterminous States consists of 297 locations of which 101 locations without control tower service have 20 or more active based aircraft. On the distribution of general aviation activities, FAA figures indicate that there are 492 public-owned airports with 20 or more based aircraft having neither flight service station nor control tower facilities. The Agency's aim is to provide service to this broader base of distribution.

Under the program presented, approximately one-half of the present FSS's will become the hard core of the system and will provide full service 24-hour communication with all en route traffic, routine weather reporting and broadcasts, monitoring of navigational aids, direction finding capability, and other regular FSS services. These hard-core stations have an average spacing of approximately 105 nautical miles and perform the normal terminal services at airports where they are located. At the remaining FSS locations that are not required as a part of the communications network, services tailored to the individual locations' needs (i.e., weather reporting, airport advisory service, weather briefing, and flight plan handling) would be provided by one of two new type facilities that will be known as FSS (Manicom) or an Airport Information Desk (AID).

The FSS (Manicom) is proposed as a part-time FSS with full terminal services. This facility will operate as a satellite of the nearest hardcore FSS. Hours of operation will be compatible with the time of greatest activity at its particular location. It will have weather observation equipment, service A weather teletype, telephone line to the area FSS, a terminal radio communications capability, and the usual complement of preflight briefing manuals. It will provide a range of terminal services of quality comparable to those presently performed by existing FSS's.

The Airport Information Desk (AID) suggested in the Administrator's plan is an unmanned flight planning desk (that would include weather observation equipment, service A teletype if needed, telephone service to the area FSS, and the usual service manuals, etc.). The extent of this installation will depend upon airport sponsor participation in furnishing space, taking weather observations, etc. From the pilots' standpoint, this type of service is now provided at many general aviation airports where the sponsor has cooperated with the FAA in providing facilities and communication lines to the nearest FSS. The proposed program would extend these facilities to a large number of active general aviation airports that now have no facilities and no prospects of becoming a manned FSS.

No implementation of this plan is contemplated until after the test program has been completed. The test program will assist in refining of details, evaluating user reaction, and reaching a decision concerning the conversion program. In addition, the Agency will consider fully the findings and recommendations of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics. This program will be subject to final review within the executive branch and presented to Congress in the President's fiscal year 1966 budget.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am also interested in the item of Federal Aviation Agency operations. The House committee recommended, and the House bill included under this item, the necessary expenses for the continuation of the existing authorized flight service stations, at least until the end of fiscal year 1965. I am interested in this item because earlier this year the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency announced a long-range program for decommissioning some 40-odd flight service stations around the country and for making consolidations of facilities of this type to meet safety needs. Among the stations slated for elimination and consolidation into stations elsewhere were two, in particular, in the State of New York, which in my judgment are essential facilities and, of all the stations planned to be eliminated, probably have the most meritorious case for retention. These two are located, respectively, at the Chemung County Airport, Elmira, N.Y., and at the Dutchess County Airport, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

I was very much gratified when the House committee decided to continue all of the existing flight service stations at least for another year. The committee report does not reflect the basis upon which it acted, but I suspect that the desire to preserve the status quo was closely tied to the fact tha the House Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics had just recently completed a set of thorough hearings on the problem and that it would be prudent to await that subcommittee's findings and recommendations before permitting the Federal Aviation Agency to go ahead with its program and reach a stage where its actions would be irreversible for all practical purposes. I say this because, to be perfectly frank, I do not think a case can be made for retaining all of the stations planned to be shut down, and there are doubtless some which can no longer be justified and whose elimination would result in savings without endangering air safety. I can only conclude, therefore, that the House committee was interested in preserving the status quo until the other House subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over air safety regulation, rendered its report.

Now, Mr. President, when the House bill came to us in the Senate, my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I made our views known to the Appropriations Committee. We urged the approval of the House provision which was designed to temporarily stay the hand of the Federal Aviation Agency in its flight service station consolidation program. We did so indicating our deep interest in the two New York stations which we believed had the best case for retention. We hoped very much that the Senate committee would concur in the judgment of the House.

However, apparently the committee was convinced that the Federal Aviation Agency should not have its hands tied in this way, and it deleted the House provision in question. I regret that action, although I can understand the interest of the committee in not wanting to preclude selected shutdowns where savings probably can be made.

Naturally, I am not in a position to offer an amendment to restore the House language. To do so would require justifiying the retention, for at least another year, of each and every flight service station around the country, which I not only am not prepared to do, but

which I think also cannot be done upon a proper factual basis. But I still feel very strongly about the case for retaining the two particular stations in New York.

I hope that the distinguished Senator from Washington and his fellow conferees will listen with care to the representations made by the House conferees and will feel that in conference they can accept the House language rather than insisting upon its elimination.

Can the Senator assure me that the Senate conferees will carefully inquire in conference with the House conferees as to their specific reasons for including the provision on retaining the flight service stations for another year, and that we can be assured there will be good discussion of that item in the conference?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure there will be, because there was apparently good discussion in the House on it. We had quite a lengthy discussion with Mr. Halaby on this matter, and he assured us that he would not—at least for the coming year—close any stations. He thought he could achieve some economies by not having stations that were perhaps on duty for 24 hours a day, but he could have them on duty for 12 hours a day and thus achieve some economies. His intention was to close 46 of the stations. He decided not to do so. He thinks he can achieve the same economies by curtailing the service which in most cases is not needed. Most of these stations are for private planes. They rarely fly at night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for that assurance. All I can say is that I hope the Senator will be convincing to the conferees by his assurance that careful consideration will be given to this matter and every possible weight given to the views which compelled the House to reach the conclusions that they did.

I can only ask for the usual courtesy and fair deliberation which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] always gives to these matters.

May I say that, if the House provision should be eliminated in conference, there will be no alternative for those of us in the New York congressional delegation but to continue to pursue this matter with the Federal Aviation Agency. I have been told that, due to the long-range nature of the Agency's consolidation program, it will probably be another year in any event before certain stations, including those in New York which I have mentioned, can be removed and, as they say, "remoted" into other locations. Therefore, it may well be that the same result will be reached as an administrative matter as would result from the adoption of the House provision. I hope that will be the case. But that is no longrun solution. For the long run, we shall have to keep plugging away at the case for keeping the absolutely essential stations. I know that is the position of most of the responsible general aviation trade and pilot associations. I intend to keep up the fight for these stations, and if the House provision is not adopted, I will bring the case before the New York congressional delegation for consideration at the earliest date.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], be printed in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the space amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR A CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

The idea of a civilian-directed, broad-based national space program has come under attack by factions of citizens who seem to consider outer space their private property to be divided among them.

These factions disagree on many things—including the rule of the military in space—but they do agree that NASA's role in space should be restricted to space probes in support of projects deemed important to the present scientific disciplines, and that Project Apollo should be crippled or abandoned.

One of these factions consists of some members of the uniformed military services and their friends.

This faction considers space primarily a potential new military battleground.

I can think of no more serious threat to our future as a great nation than to dismantle the national space program by treating it as some run-of-the-mill source of money and manpower to be seized by old-line public and private interests.

The age of space adds an entirely new dimension to the human experience. It will be one of the main stages upon which world history will be acted for centuries to come.

When the age of space began in 1957, many of us instantly realized that we were at one of those watersheds of history from which time would be measured into the future. We believed that those nations that best learned how to use outer space would be best able to play a leading role in the future of the world. We were determined that the United States would be such a nation.

But all we knew about space 7 years ago was that we knew so little about it.

In November 1957, the month after Sputnik I was launched, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, began hearings on the state of the Nation's satellite and missile programs.

The subcommittee took impressive testimony to the effect that space must be explored so that man can find out his capabilities there—and that it must be explored as a new dimension, and not from the viewpoint of any current interest.

Testimony was also given to the effect that this was the best way to develop space so that it could be used for scientific and national security purposes—to be used, in short, for the benefit of the Nation and the world.

Since no one could then imagine what space might be used for in 5, 10, or 20 years, it was best to organize the Nation to explore space in all its ramifications.

But the subcommittee was naturally concerned with the national security implications of a national space program.

The answer given to the subcommittee was this: The best way for the military to learn how to use space was to allow it to be explored by scientists whose chief concern was to obtain as much knowledge about space as possible.

The military would then be able to define military missions in space, and carry out its own experiments on the basis of the knowledge acquired.

Witnesses said that the military's primary duty was to protect the Nation here and now. Given, therefore, a choice between advanced research and development, and developing currently conceivable weapons systems, they would have no choice but to perform the latter at the expense of the former. But this in turn means that many new advanced weapons systems would not be developed because there was no current need for them.

Dr. Wernher von Braun pointed out at the hearings that the Nation lacked a powerful rocket engine at the dawn of the space age because it had no military need for one. (The Russians needed one because their nuclear warheads were heavier at the time.) But we did need one to explore space adequately—and we didn't have it.

The atomic bomb, the airplane, the submarine, radar, the machinegun—you name it—virtually every major military innovation was begun under civilian guidance or instigation. In short, develop an advanced system of technology and the military will find a use for it.

Dr. Edward Teller was asked if he thought a lunar mission would have any military significance. He replied:

"I am sure it will have * * * a great military advantage.

"But don't ask me, please, what it is. My imagination is not good enough for that.

"If you had asked me about ballistic missiles in 1945 or 1946, I would have said, 'Let's do it, and let's do it fast,' and then you would have said: 'In what particular way will you apply this in a possible war?' and I would have told you, 'I don't know, but once we make it we will find some use.'

"And I think going to the moon is in the same category."

President Eisenhower and his advisers concluded that space should be explored by a new civilian agency created especially for this purpose, and the Eisenhower administration in April 1958 introduced a bill to create what became the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This bill received the unanimous bipartisan support of the Congress, including the support of those Members most sensitive to the Nation's national defense requirements.

The Space Act was carefully drafted to give the Department of Defense full leeway to conduct such space experiments it deems necessary to the national defense.

Let me conclude, Mr. President, by pointing out a few facts that might have escaped some critics of our national space program:

1. The Defense Department has—and always has had—a space budget of its own—about one and a half billion dollars during each of the past 3 fiscal years.

2. The administrations of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have encouraged the Defense Department to originate its own space projects to determine how space may best be used to promote the Nation's security—the current manned orbital laboratory is an example.

3. There has been constant improvement in the liaison among the operational agencies concerned with space: NASA, DOD, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Weather Bureau. This enables DOD to take advantage of the other agencies' work in the space field.

There are those who feel that DOD should have a larger space budget, but that is not the issue here. The issue is: Should a budget that provides for an orderly national space program—a program that promises so many benefits to the Nation and one that will prevent our Nation's being surprised again as it was in 1957—be cut because other agencies want more money? The answer is obviously "No."

Those who talk about priorities want money transferred from the national space program to their own pet projects. But we know, Mr. President, that the Congress does not work that way. Money taken from NASA is not turned over to other agencies, but lost, and the damage done by any space project so crippled will not be made up in other ways of benefit to the United States.

Finally, for every military man who says that NASA's program is of no benefit to the Nation's security, there are several who believe that it is. This subject was debated in the Senate November 20, 1963, when last year's independent offices appropriations bill was before us. My good right arm on the Senate Space Committee, the senior Senator from Missouri, delivered an excellent speech on that occasion. I submit for printing in the RECORD that speech, as well as statements by some of the Nation's leading national defense experts in favor of the NASA program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the debate on this amendment yesterday, certain statements were made which would indicate that the civilian space program has little military value.

The statement was made also that the manned lunar program is not essential to the Nation's security. To my knowledge, no one has contended that the Nation will be any weaker or less able to defend itself if this program is substantially cut back.

To support these statements, answers by Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were used.

Mr. President, I have listened to testimony from many witnesses, both civilian and military, over the past few years; and while there is some disagreement, of course, as to the manner in which the programs shall be pursued, I have yet to hear anyone, particularly in the military, say that our overall national space program does not materially aid the national security of the United States.

I take this opportunity to quote some of the military figures and defense figures who have testified in recent days with respect to the question now before the Senate.

General LeMay, who appeared before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the Defense Department Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1964, stated on page 587 of those hearings, and in answer to a question whether there was much military application to our moon shot program, application to military requirements, the following:

"No, it is not aimed primarily at military application, but I am sure a lot of the techniques and scientific information that evolves from this program will have military application and use."

General LeMay later answered with respect to a question whether he thought it was wise for the United States as a nation to undertake the expenditures in space to reach the moon in a manned flight:

"This is a very difficult one to answer from a strictly military standpoint, of course, I would rather be trying to go to the moon for other reasons—in other words, aim it as a military project rather than just a scientific project, let science fall out rather than let the military applications fall out of it."

Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert, in appearing before the Armed Services Committee of the House on military posture hearings, stated:

"In recognition of the increased impact of space programs on our national resources and their direct effect on our future national security, Air Force space activities are closely coordinated with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. One example is the recent agreement between the Defense Department and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the Gemini program."

Let me quote from Gen. Bernard Schriever, who appeared before the House Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics in the hearings on the NASA fiscal year 1964 authorization:

In connection with General Schriever, especially now that Admiral Raborn has retired, I believe it would be almost universally agreed that no one knows more about newer weaponry and newer weaponry plans than the able general who now heads the Air Force Systems Command, General Schriever.

On page 833, General Schriever is shown to have stated:

"I have also often stated my belief that the civilian and military portions of the national space program must complement each other with closest possible relationships at all working levels. This is why I have taken management and organizational steps such as establishing General Ritland as my Deputy for Manned Space Flight."

Quoting General Schriever further in the same hearings, in answer to the question:

Is this manned trip to the moon necessary in your judgment?

General Schriever's answer was:

"I have always felt that a lunar program was an essential objective for the overall national space effort."

General Schriever later in answer to a question asked of him whether there is both a civilian as well as a military gain or benefit from this research and development for the manned lunar landing, answered:

"Yes, definitely. Here again it is a little bit difficult to compile a laundry list of specific items and say these all have applications to the military mission. However, I can point out certain things. The Gemini program, for example, certainly has tremendous contributions to make in the objectives of that program. The whole matter of the man and creating an environment for man to operate in is absolutely essential from a military point of view.

"The near earth activities are of greater interest to us than the ones that are essentially involved with a lunar orbit and the lunar part of the job. That does not mean that some future date this will not also interest us."

I would like to quote from the House Committee on Science and Astronautics hearings on space posture when General Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, testified as follows:

"The space activities of NASA have produced and will continue to produce highly important data which is available for application to problems of national security * * *. In seeking to identify and advance the development of military capabilities for space, the Air Force wishes to take full advantage of the important knowledge that NASA acquires. We strongly support, in both thought and action, the necessity and the value of NASA's scientific explorations."

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the letter introduced in the RECORD on August 9 of this year by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] in connection with NASA's authorization. The letter was addressed to Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Senate Space Committee, from Brockway McMillan, Under Secretary of the Air Force. Mr. McMillan commented on the military items in the NASA fiscal year 1964 budget. I will not take the time to read the whole letter, but simply quote from it. In it Mr. McMillan stated:

"In our search for military benefits which the Defense Department might derive from the NASA program, we have found there are many technical areas wherein advances by either agency will benefit both. It is particularly clear that the broad underlying base of technology being produced by the NASA will substantially benefit military space programs."

Finally, I would like to quote from testimony by Mr. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense, before the Senate Space Committee, in connection with NASA's fiscal year 1964 authorization. Mr. Gilpatric's testimony can be found complete in part 1 of these hearings beginning on page 604. I will not read the entire statement, but will only make mention of a part of his statement in which he said:

"First, the United States has a single national space program. The Defense Department and the NASA are each responsible for major portions of that program. It is a primary policy objective of both of us that our efforts in the Defense Department and those of the NASA shall be conceived, planned, and executed to insure that the totality of our space efforts adds up to a single program in the national interest * * *. Space, like other mediums, affords useful and often unique ways for achieving defense objectives. Some of these are by no means uniquely military—improved ways to communicate or keep track of the weather worldwide are simply examples. Other applications may turn out to be more distinctly and uniquely useful and necessary from a strictly military point of view * * *. Space systems and devices are not simply military or nonmilitary merely because they are developed by one agency or another, since that factor does not uniquely determine their future application. Moreover, our national successes and failures in space may have significance outside the purely military domain, since they support national endeavors and validate our national will and strength in the eyes of the entire world."

I have taken the time of the Senate to quote statements made by some of our best military and civilian Defense Department officials because I feel it is important to show that our civilian space program has much application to our national security. I would not like the idea left that there will be no military benefits derived from our civilian space program. The fact that there is no direct benefit in the form of a military weapons operations system is not important at this time. I would only add in closing that I doubt if in 1907 when the Wright brothers first succeeded in lifting their fragile craft off the ground, there were very many people who stood up and said that this feat was of tremendous military significance. However, history has shown us that less than a decade later airplanes were playing a very important part in the prosecution of World War I.

I do not believe anyone at this time can possibly foresee the utilization that will be made of space. I have personally supported the U.S. position that space shall be utilized for peaceful purposes, but for myself I wish to see our program go forward so that in the future, should it ever become necessary, the United States will be in a position of preeminence in space and able to defend itself or take the offensive in this medium as well as on the land, on the sea, and in the air.

In that connection, I mentioned yesterday remarks of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas White, before he retired from the Air Force. Going back to the days when this Agency was created, there was a great deal of apprehension about the arbitrary demarcation between the civilian and

military interest in space. If it had not been for the able late senior Senator from New Hampshire, Senator Bridges, I think it fair to say the military would have had little or no position in space.

When the bill was considered—and the legislative history and the hearings held at that time will so verify—it was realized that the military should have a vital interest in the space program; and as one has watched the rapid developments in recent years years in what might be called the art of defense—I hope my colleagues will realize that this art has changed more in the past 15 years that it did in the previous thousand.

The former President of the United States, and a former great military leader, Dwight D. Eisenhower, recently said he thought we should heavily reduce the number of ground forces we have in Europe at this time. I have felt that way for some time, for many different reasons. If all this is a question of expense, I would prefer to see this country save money—especially as in this case it would help us with our serious problem of unfavorable balance of payments—by taking some of our divisions out of Europe, rather than compromising in the newest of all arts, space, in which medium someday we might be forced to defend our country.

For these reasons, I shall vote against this reduction, and hope the Senate will also take into consideration the fact the amount recommended in the bill has already been reduced between some $600 million from what the administration originally requested.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force: "It is my opinion, as a military man, that we need without question to acquire a space capability at the earliest practicable date. The steps are clear. In order to acquire the capabilities we need, we have to solve these basic problems: One, we have to insure man's ability to work and survive in the space environment for extended periods of time. Another, we must attain the capability to place large payloads in space reliably and economically. This calls for a cheap or recoverable booster. Again we must have the capability to rendezvous with, support, and recover space payloads. Also we must acquire the means to communicate and maneuver in aerospace." (Oct. 26, 1961, speech before the Michigan post, American Ordnance Association, Detroit, Mich.)

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force: "* * * Space will have an increasing effect on the whole gamut of political, psychosocial, and economic aspects of this Nation and the other nations of the world in the next several years. Our Nation's preeminence and our responsibilities as the leader of the free world require that we remain in the forefront of space development and utilization." (Feb. 27, 1962, statement before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D.C.)

Lt. Gen. James E. Briggs, commander, Air Training Command: "Clearly the U.S. space program is a national program in which the military is an active partner. While projects, missions, and efforts of NASA and the military services necessarily differ, there are basic efforts relating to space that are common and noncompetitive." (Feb. 19, 1963, speech before the American Association of Education Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J.)

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert: "Before I say anything about our future in space, let me establish two benchmarks. The first is that the Air Force needs everything it can get from NASA. NASA needs us, too, as the record of how NASA puts things into space indicates, but if there weren't a NASA, the same facility and capability would have to be created some other way. There is reassuring precedent for the principle of having an outside-of-defense civilian agency provide the type of support we need." (March 1963, speech to personnel at the Air Force Missile Test Center at Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.)

Commander, Strategic Air Command, Gen. Thomas S. Power: "We must continue our intensive nonmilitary effort along the entire spectrum of space and space-related sciences. The primary responsibility for this effort rests with the NASA. Its close cooperation with the Department of Defense will not only further its own objectives of the peaceful conquest of space but also help create the building blocks for the future military systems which may be required, to repeat President Kennedy's words, 'to make sure that space is maintained for peaceful purposes.'" (Second meeting on manned space flight, Dallas, Tex., Apr. 24, 1963.)

Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric, before the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Science, April 29, 1963: "The totality of our military space efforts, assessed from a national rather than a departmental standpoint, greatly exceeds the efforts of the Department of Defense alone. Space systems and devices are not simply military or nonmilitary merely because they are developed by one agency or another, since that factor does not uniquely determine their future application. Moreover, our national successes and failures in space may have significance outside the purely military domain, since they support national endeavors and validate our national will and strength in the eyes of the entire world."

Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk, USAF, Commander, Space Systems Division (AFSC): "I am not surprised that people frequently ask: 'Why do we want to go into space?' Essentially, there are four good reasons for our interests in space. First to increase national prestige, and the importance of this I am sure is evident; second, to acquire knowledge; third, to benefit human welfare; and fourth, to strengthen national security. Naturally, we in the military are concerned primarily about defense and security, yet we recognize that all four reasons are related and—to some degree—interdependent, just as our civil and military space efforts are complementary and mutually productive. In short, we are aware that we must decide where we are going, and we must begin to acquire deeper practical experience in our space ventures. This is fundamental to any effective military space posture we hope to fashion. Of course, experimentation and exploration, as ends in themselves, are luxuries the military services can ill afford. We benefit heavily, therefore, from the investigative programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The partnership approach to the Defense Department's military space needs and NASA's nonmilitary responsibilities is a logical course to follow in the fulfillment of common space objectives. It is elemental to our mutual quest for space experience." (Article which appeared in the September-October 1963 issue of Rendezvous.)

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle speech, October 5, 1963: "I have great admiration for the balanced program that NASA has been able to achieve. This balanced program well meets the requirements of science, assures mastery of the art of manned space flight, provides the benfits to all mankind that wil flow from useful satellites and space technology, and observes the stern necessity to prepare now in the laboratory for the space achievements and space security of the next decade and, indeed, of the next century."

Dr. Albert C. Hall, Deputy Director (Space), DOD Research and Engineering: "The United States has a single national space program clearly devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind * * * space systems and devices are not simply military or nonmilitary or peaceful or aggressive merely because they are developed by one agency or another. In the broad context of national security, the United States successes and failure in space may have significance for cold war political maneuvering while affecting, as well, the balance of world military power. (Oct. 22, 1963, speech to Conference on Areospace and Navigational Electronics, Baltimore, Md.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my final amendment, No. 1171. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 12, lines 24–25, strike out "and purchase of eight aircraft; $66,000,000," and insert "$65,071,000".

FAA'S HIGH-FLYING HIGH COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have pointed out in the past the extravagant waste that has been involved in the purchase and use of FAA aircraft. In addition, the General Accounting Office has given many examples of specific waste in the use of these aircraft. Since my original comments on this matter several months ago, I have received an amazing amount of mail from private pilots, airline pilots, aviation personnel, and even FAA personnel documenting additional instances of inefficient and nongovernmental use of FAA planes. I know that agency regulations attempt to prevent this type of problem, but it is obvious from the many, many cases which have come to my attention that these regulations have failed to solve the difficulties.

We in the Congress have an opportunity to take a very small step toward eliminating the problems of abuse. I have offered an amendment which would provide that, with respect to the total appropriation for FAA facilities and equipment, the provision for the purchase of eight new aircraft would be eliminated and an amount of $929,000 for such aircraft would also be removed.

Mr. President, I had earlier indicated my intent to reduce the provision in the bill for new facilities and equipment by approximately $2 million. However, cuts already made by the House and Senate have significantly reduced the general appropriations for this category of expenditures. Unfortunately, the provision for the purchase of the eight new aircraft has been retained in the bill.

Mr. President, the FAA has already paid some $446,110 for these aircraft on a lease-purchase basis. Therefore, the total cost of these planes is $1,375,110. The average price for each plane is $171,889. Just think of that. The price for any one of these aircraft is roughly the

cost of nine moderately priced homes for taxpayers who are paying these bills.

How has FAA justified these new planes? To quote the Agency's own justification, in its entirety:

To maintain general aviation inspectors current and proficient in modern aircraft, to fulfill long-trip requirements of air traffic inflight evaluation programs, and to provide adequate aircraft for headquarters and regional administrative travel.

Thus, the first justification is that FAA inspectors who must check out general aviation pilots must have these planes in order to keep proficient in general aviation aircraft. This sounds reasonable until we discover that out of approximately 131,000 general aviation aircraft in the United States, there are only a total of 221 Queen Airs, which is the type the FAA wishes to purchase. In other words, FAA has picked undoubtedly the most atypical general aviation aircraft in existence—and incidentally the most luxurious—in order to keep proficient in general aviation planes. Moreover, FAA has virtually none of all the other types of aircraft in which 99.9 percent of pilots fly. We don't hear anything about FAA Pipers, Cessnas, Mooneys, Stinsons, Aeroncas, Navions, or other less expensive aircraft. In fact, of all these common types, FAA has only three planes. Obviously, FAA must have only the best—and most rare—aircraft for proficiency in general aviation.

Incidentially, each of these aircraft that FAA wishes to purchase has over $70,000 of special instruments and electrical equipment. Is this typical of the general aircraft? Obviously not, since few can afford such instrumentation. If experience in typical aircraft is desired, obviously FAA should intentionally avoid such instrumentation in order to understand the ways of the general pilot. It might be argued that FAA must also know about the instrumentation in airliners. But FAA has 122 other planes already that can provide this type of knowledge. Why in the name of the heavens they fly in must FAA have eight more aircraft with such atypical instrumentation, when so many planes are already available?

The next justification for these aircraft is in order to take FAA personnel on long trips where they can allegedly check in-flight air traffic procedures. The striking fact is that this is already the function of virtually all of the other 122 aircraft in the FAA fleet. The agency has 82 aircraft just for "Facilities flight inspection and logistics flying" and another 12 for "Job performance and proficiency flying."

Another, and just as basic criticism of this justification is that the 8 planes which the FAA wishes to purchase are not typical aircraft and therefore are a poor way to test in-flight air traffic procedures, when these procedures are principally by planes nowhere near as fully equipped.

The third justification is the one that should make every citizen's blood boil. We are asked to approve the expenditure of over $1 million so that a few headquarters and regional agency officials will have "adequate" aircraft for travel. This, incidentally, is not for the Administrator who has his own million-dollar aircraft, but for other officials at lower levels.

Who else in the executive branch, who else in Congress, who else among taxpayers generally gets this kind of free "adequate" travel? This is the area where the General Accounting Office has shown the cases of the families getting free transportation to Florida, the conveyance of friends to their homes, the accidents and the destruction of Government property on essentially private trips. And these planes must be "adequate" for this purpose; namely, they must be the most expensive planes that the FAA can buy.

I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I know of no such use of the FAA planes as that suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin. I have not made any inquiry. I have relied on the General Accounting and administrative Offices themselves.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also invite the attention of Senators to the fact that I made a public statement on this question for the RECORD, several months ago. In the statement I cited instance after instance of this abuse taking place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This item involves new planes. We cannot anticipate what the new planes will be used for. They have had ample opportunity to use them in pilot training, and checking them out. That is why we allowed the item. I assure the Senator that we shall be glad to inquire into the other matters in greater detail.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The FAA knows that the purpose was to train a large number of flight check pilots, and also to give air check time to the thousands of aircraft control personnel so that they will understand what is going on in the pilot's cockpit as they are being dispatched to a safe landing from a control tower. They need this air experience. That is one of the main reasons why a large fleet—primarily consisting of DC–3's, the old veritable gooney-bird—is used so extensively in the FAA. However, because their check pilots will also check out the pilots who will fly the 707's and the fast four-motor jets, the very fast executive aircraft of a jet character, and all other types of planes, they must have quite a large and diversified fleet.

I am very surprised that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has not heard of a Beechcraft aircraft. It is one of the famous names in aviation.

I believe that if the Senator will look at the census of executive aircraft, the small type aircraft that businessmen generally fly, he will find that is one of the late models of executive aircraft made by Beech in Wichita, Kans.

These are not expensive planes. The planes themselves would cost in the neighborhood of perhaps $150,000, which is rated rather low for executive aircraft. Many executive aircraft cost as much as $1 million. Some of the better small jet aircraft cost as much as $500,000. But, to be useful, the planes for the FAA must have a great deal of electronic gear in them if they are to be able to check, to train, and to pinpoint the air navigational aids that are used throughout the FAA system and in this training. This plane consumes a very small amount of fuel compared with the larger planes, and therefore, if necessary, they are used for visits which must be made to other training centers or to take officials of the FAA around. I am sure these planes would be recommended rather than the DC–3's, the military Jetstar that the distinguished Senator has mentioned, or even the 707 Boeing planes that are used for checking and testing the pilots and also for checking navigational aids and air navigation in high altitudes.

So when we consider the eight planes that we are buying, while I do not know the exact price, I do know that the amount of radio and electronic gear that is in those planes in considerable, and that the cost is greater than the cost of equipment found in ordinary planes, because they must be exact, useful, and always available for the testing of the air navigational system. This item is important to equip the FAA with new model planes. These happen to be six-place planes, which is perhaps one of the reasons that not so many are sold, because twin motor executive aircraft planes of this type generally have a smaller seating capacity than a six-place plane.

I do not believe the amendment is needed. It is unnecessary to take eight planes out of the fleet, and particularly planes that are more economical to operate than many that are left in the fleet to be maintained.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table indicating the total aircraft fleet of FAA be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Aircraft fleet (end of year totals)

	Number of engines and engine type	Estimate June 30—	
		1964	1965
1. FAA-owned aircraft:			
(a) Aircraft for facilities flight inspection and logistics flying:			
Boeing C–135	4 jet	3	3
Convair Allison	2 turboprop	5	5
Lockheed L–749	4 piston	4	4
Fairchild C–123	2 piston	1	1
Douglas DC–3	do	56	56
Douglas C–54	4 piston	6	6
Convair T–29	2 piston	7	6
Subtotal		82	81
(b) Aircraft for job performance, proficiency flying:			
Lockheed TV–2	1 jet	5	5
Gulfstream G–159	2 turboprop	1	1
Douglas DC–3	2 piston	1	1
Lockheed L–1329	4 jet	1	1
Beech M–65	2 piston	2	2
Beech M–80	do		8
Subtotal		10	18

Aircraft fleet (end of year totals)—Con.

	Number of engines and engine type	Estimate June 30— 1964	1965
1. FAA-owned, etc.—Con.			
(c) Aircraft for training:			
Convair CV-880	4 jet	1	1
Boeing 727	do	1	1
Boeing 720	do	1	1
Lockheed L-188	4 turboprop	1	1
Douglas DC-6B	4 piston	2	2
Convair 340	2 piston	2	2
Douglas DC-3	do	4	4
Convair T-29	do	1	2
Subtotal		13	14
(d) Aircraft operated for research and development test and evaluation:			
Aero Commander.	2 piston	2	2
Piper PA-22	1 piston	1	1
Convair JC-131b	2 piston	2	2
Convair T-29	do	2	2
Douglas DC-7	4 piston	1	1
Gulfstream G-159.	2 turboprop	1	1
F-9J Cougar	1 jet	1	1
Beech T-34	2 piston	1	1
Subtotal		[1] 11	[1] 11
Total FAA-owned aircraft.		116	124
2. Commercial leased aircraft:			
(a) Aircraft for facilities flight inspection:			
Douglas DC-3	2 piston	1	1
(b) Aircraft for job performance, proficiency flying:			
Beech M-80	do	8	
Piper PA-24	1 piston	2	2
Subtotal		10	2
(c) Aircraft for training:			
Aero Commander AC-560.	2 piston	1	1
Beech M-35	do	1	1
Beech M-50	do	1	1
Subtotal		3	3
Total commercial leased aircraft.		14	6
Total FAA fleet.		130	130

[1] Includes 3 aircraft on loan from the military.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I made no attack on the Boeings, the Lockheeds, the Douglas, or the DC-3's. Specifically, I singled out the Queen Aire, and, as I say, the justification for those planes is "to maintain general aviation inspectors current and proficient in modern aircraft, and so on."

Mr. President, it is clear that very few modern aircraft have anything like $75,000 worth of radio equipment, let alone the rest of the cost of the aircraft.

My argument is that these planes are atypical. They are luxurious, and they do not give the aircraft inspectors and others, the kind of experience which the justification says they should have, and which alone justifies buying new planes.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington wishes to yield back the remainder of him time, I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Before I do so, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin what he means by luxurious. A plane is a plane. Is the Senator speaking about a plane which has a softer seat than another plane or what is it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about the cost.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A big plane is a big plane.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator should buy a car for $1,500, it would have an adequately soft seat and a nice looking instrument panel. At the same time the Senator could spend $6,000 for a more powerful and luxurious automobile. That is what I am taking about in relation to planes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A more efficient plane.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator might put it that way—a plane that flies faster, carries more people, and probably more booze and steaks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 7, it is proposed to strike the numeral and insert "$19,200,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended an appropriation of $154,200,000 for civil defense purposes in the independent offices appropriations bill. This is $65 million more than approved by the House of Representatives.

The administration originally requested $358 million for civil defense functions for fiscal year 1965. Our colleagues in the other body wisely approved only one-fourth of this amount.

Mr. President, the bulk of this $65 million increase is an additional $50 million for fallout shelters. Instead of continuing to waste taxpayers' money on this project, the House allowed only $19,200,000 for research, shelter survey and marking. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended $69,200,000 for this purchase. In my view, all appropriations for civil defense purposes over and above those needed for proper education and research functions are a waste of taxpayers' money. I especially object to any funds for construction of fallout shelters. Toward that end I have sent to the desk an amendment that will strike $50 million from this appropriation. This represents the additional amount recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations over the amount approved by the House of Representatives for research, shelter survey, and marking.

Over the past 13 years, more than $1,300,000 of taxpayers' money has been foolishly wasted on silly civil defense schemes. Today, 18 years after Hiroshima, we have no civil defense worthy of the name. Most of what exists consists of absurd plans on paper; the rest is confusion.

Any shelter program large enough to be meaningful—if such a thing is possible—would cost many billions of dollars. However, civil defense officials follow the bureaucratic rule of keeping first estimates low enough to induce Congress to authorize some colossal lunacy, knowing that they can always get more once a program is born.

We are confronted with a dilemma. I quote Jonathan Swift, who wrote:

A strong dilemma in a desperate case: to act with infamy or quit the place.

Those favoring a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it would cost anywhere from $20 to $200 billion. In their book entitled "Strategy for Survival," Thomas L. Morton, dean of the College of Engineers at the University of Arizona, and Donald C. Latham, an electronics researcher, concluded that a national community shelter program would cost in excess of $37 billion.

Herman Kahn, one of the foremost proponents of fallout shelters, has estimated that a reasonable program might involve a gradual buildup from about $1 billion annually to somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 billion annually. A recent estimate by Prof. John Ullman, chairman of the Department of Management of Hofstra College, would place the cost as high as $302 billion. Regardless of which of the expert opinions is cited, the price tag would be astronomical. Even then, there is no guarantee that a shelter program will be at all effective. With extensive advances being made in rocket and nuclear technology, it would probably be obsolete before completion. One of the scientists now working on advanced weapons technology is reported to have said: "You ain't seen nothing yet." Compared with what is coming into sight in the way of new weapons.

There is always the possibility of more deadly types of warfare for which shelters offer no protection whatever—chemical and biological warfare. Any nation that would unleash a thermonuclear war would probably not hesitate to use other methods equally as terrifying.

Is the Congress prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and to spend perhaps $200 billion of taxpayers' money? Let us have no illusions. In reality, this is what the civil defense planners are asking us to do.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to look into the matter is aware of the fact that most building owners have ignored or refused requests to provide shelters, and that ordinary citizens have lost interest. During each crisis the get-rich-quick shelter salesmen appear. As soon as the crisis abates and public interest fades, they crawl back under the rocks from whence they came.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that through the years this Nation and the Soviet Union were building up our nuclear capacities, no real interest could be stirred up among the general public or in the Congress for any form of civil defense. It is true that during that time over $1,300 million was appropriated in piecemeal fashion but not for any really serious or effective plan of action.

Actually, we were soothing our consciences "just in case" a nuclear war would come. Year after year we appropriated $75 million or $100 million or $80 million for civil defense purposes, always "just in case." Neither the Eisenhower administration nor this administration nor the Congress over the past 13 years has really faced up to this issue. It was always easier to pretend that something was being done.

It is only human to grasp at straws when faced by an overwhelmingly difficult situation, and in appropriating these funds which gradually began to total a staggering sum, this is what was done. No one in his heart really believed that the civil defense fishnet would be of any protection in a surging sea of nuclear destruction.

Mr. President, Senators will recall that in the midst of the Berlin crisis in the summer of 1961, Congress hurriedly appropriated $200 million for fallout shelters. No American family was made any safer or more secure as a result of that expenditure. It in no way has deterred the aggressive acts of the Soviet and Red Chinese dictators. Of course, architectural firms, building contractors, and survival biscuitmakers have benefited at taxpayers' expense. We head about millions of survival biscuits that have been purchased from a certain large grocery concern. They will never be used, of course. Most have rotted away. Some money has been put in circulation, but taxpayers have suffered.

The Cuban crisis proved that our best and probably only civil defense in this nuclear age is a firm, determined, resolute stand against aggression, such as was taken by the late great President Kennedy in October 1962, plus the nuclear power which we have to support it. We would be far wiser to appropriate additional funds for our missile programs, and our missile-bearing Polaris submarines, then for civil defense schemes that are hopeless at their inception.

Nevertheless, the civil defense planers continue to mesmerize the American public with the illusion that we have an effective civil defense program. Although the Congress appropriated $208 million in 1961 and an additional $38 million in 1962 for marking and provisioning fallout shelters, when the crisis came most of them could not be found, were not marked, or were unusable. Only a handful were provisioned. Rations and medical kits on which millions of dollars had been spent were still stocked in Federal warehouses and arsenals. Warning systems were inadequate and virtually useless. This is probably not too important, for in event of attack there would be, at most, perhaps 10 minutes' warning before the intercontinental ballistic missiles fell on American cities.

Incidentally, I note that in the budget for fiscal year 1965, the average salary for paid civil defense employees will be, before the recent pay raise, $10,592 a year, one of the highest in the entire Federal bureauacy.

By comparison employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will average $9,206; $9,576 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and $8,015 for the Small Business Administration, to name a few of the many important Government agencies where the average salary is less than that for civil defense employees. It would be difficult to find another agency in the Federal Government where so many have done so little to earn so much.

We must not be content to let the civil defense program drift, unconcerned about the dollars being wasted. A national disaster organization is a necessity; Alaska learned the value of such a corps after the Good Friday earthquake. But it needs redirection—with more emphasis on natural disasters and perhaps even a change of name.

Americans have always come to the aid of their neighbors when disaster threatened. I am sure that the thousands of unpaid volunteer civil defense workers, many of whom who have performed outstanding services in time of flood and other natural disaster, will continue to volunteer for any future emergencies.

The notion of civil defense as a standby agency for nuclear holocaust is unrealistic. The kind of thing needed is a disaster corps, trained for all kinds of emergencies, acts of man and God.

Mr. President, it gives me no pleasure whatever to oppose an administration program. It is laudable that an attempt is being made to offer Americans some form of survival insurance in event of a nuclear attack. However, the premiums are so fantastically expensive and the risk so remote that the kind of insurance offered in this bill is a waste of money.

Certainly some sensible forms of catastrophe planning are in order. However, I assert that it is not sound planning to divert substantial resources and effort into a program which offers very little true insurance, and which encourages a cruel illusion of security.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment which would save $50 million of taxpayers' money. This is a way for Senators who are in favor of economy to show they mean what they say. We all speak in favor of economy. I do not know a single proposal with respect to which we could more clearly demonstrate our desire for economy than this amendment. I hope Senators will grasp this opportunity to start to put an end to this utter folly.

I offer the amendment seriously. I believe that over the years the civil defense shelter program has been a waste of money. I think citizens generally do not realize that there is no fallout shelter when a nuclear warhead is properly aimed and hits the target by exploding in the atmosphere to accomplish the maximum destruction and destroy the most people.

I yield back my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in connection with the amendment, to place in the RECORD at this point the justification of the committee for this item, consisting of what are known as the sideslips, pages 35 through 37, and also an extract from page 4 of the report.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTIFICATION

Amendment of language will provide for restoration of funds in shelter programs authorized by current legislation, insert specific authority for stocking similar to that enacted in the 1964 Apropriations Act and increase research and development to the amount requested in the estimate.

	H.R. 11296 approval	Budget estimate	Increase requested
1. Shelters:			
(a) Shelter survey and marking	$9,200,000	$9,200,000	0
(b) Shelter stocking	0	100,900,000	$100,900,000
(c) Identification of existing fallout protection in smaller structures	0	7,200,000	7,200,000
(d) Designing shelter systems	0	10,000,000	10,000,000
(e) Shelter development	0	103,300,000	0
(f) Shelter in Federal buildings	0	20,000,000	0
Total, shelters	9,200,000	250,600,000	118,100,000
2. Research and development	10,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000
Total	19,200,000	265,600,000	123,100,000

1. Shelters

The program goal is the development of a nationwide system of fallout shelters, properly equipped and provisioned, to protect our population from the fallout effects of nuclear attack. It is estimated that a total of 240 million shelters spaces are required to meet this goal. The following statistics reflect progress by fiscal year, in millions of shelter spaces:

	Spaces located		Licensed and marked		Supplies available	
	Fiscal year	Cumulative	Fiscal year	Cumulative	Fiscal year	Cumulative
1962–63	104.6	104.6	42.8	42.8	50.0	50.0
1964	17.2	121.8	31.2	74.0	10.2	60.2
1965	6.2	128.0	5.0	79.0	18.8	79.0

The increase requested of $118.1 million provides the funds to meet the fiscal year 1965 objectives set forth above as well as to lay the base for obtaining additional operational shelter space in fiscal year 1966. The increase includes:

(a) Forty-six million four hundred thousand dollars for procurement of standard shelter provisions for stocking an additional 18.8 million shelter spaces. The supplies required through fiscal year 1965 are based upon a conservative projection of

actual stocking experience during the 1½ years since inception of the program. Through early May 1964, balanced quantities of supplies to sustain 2 weeks occupancy for 22.2 million people have been placed in shelter areas in 43,000 facilities. However, the rated capacity of potential space in these facilities is sufficient to accommodate 34 million people, indicating that stock issue experience amounts to 65 percent of the total capacity of surveyed shelter areas. Application of this percentage factor to the 128 million spaces located in fiscal year 1965 results in a shelter supplies requirement of 83.2 million spaces. This has been discounted down to 79 million on the basis of experience rates in building owner refusals to accept stocks.

(b) Fifty-four million five hundred thousand dollars for equipment for improving shelter capacity and use. Of this amount, $50 million is related to the procurement of portable ventilation kits which, when placed in shelter areas already located by the national shelter survey, would provide for an additional 20 million licensed spaces at a cost of $2.50 per shelter space. This compares to approximately $11.90 per space for permanent ventilation improvements and $25 or more per space in new construction.

(c) Seven million two hundred thousand million dollars for the identification of existing fallout protection in structures such as private home basements and small buildings not previously covered by the national shelter survey. Location of the space available in these smaller shelters can make a significant contribution to the total of 50 to 55 million spaces which Defense Department projections indicate are required from private initiative to achieve fallout protection for the entire population. The identification of shelter space will be accomplished for single family homes by means of a high-speed computer analyzing data as submitted by the homeowner and for other small structures by a visit of an engineer to complete a simple data collection form. It is estimated that all single family homes with basements will have the opportunity of being analyzed, and that 73,400 small structures other than single family homes would also be surveyed. These small shelters do not meet Federal public shelter criteria of a minimum of 50 spaces per facility and, therefore, will not be marked and stocked at Federal expense.

(d) Ten million dollars to provide professional community planning services to local governments to help establish a workable shelter system which will include the assignment of individuals to specific shelters. Thees initial assignments will also define, with precision, areas of shelter deficit in which low cost opportunities to create more shelter should be exploited. The updating effort, estimated to require up to $1 million annually as new shelter space is created, would not be federally funded.

2. Research and development

The civil defense fiscal year 1965 research budget was established at the minimum level of $15 million after careful study and review of research requirements. The House Appropriations Committee has recognized the need for research by stating in its fiscal year 1963 report on the Office of Civil Defense budget request that "more study and research should be applied to the vast and complex problems involved." However, the House committee has consistently acted to reduce the requested funds; to $11 million in fiscal year 1963, to $10 million in fiscal year 1964 and $10 million in fiscal year 1965. The constantly accelerating pace of modern science is reflected in continuously improved weapons and methods of delivery. There is an obvious parallel need to keep abreast in developing effective methods for protecting the civilian population from these weapons effects and to provide the means for recovery in the event of an attack on this country. Research, properly planned and supported, can supply answers to many of the pressing questions facing civil defense today. The result will be a greatly improved and much more economical civil defense program.

The effect of the proposed restoration of funds will be reflected in many ways. It will enable us to undertake urgent new studies now backlogged because of lack of funds. It will provide for better utilization of recent advances in science and technology. It will provide missing knowledge on weapons effects and countermeasures to them. More specifically, it will provide for increased effort in many critical areas including lower cost shelter designs; improved means for protection from blast, thermal, and radiation effects; accelerated investigations of ventilation and other environmental and management problems associated with full utilization of existing shelter space. It will enable us to expedite research on fire problems resulting from nuclear attack such as fire spread and active countermeasures. It will prevent reduction of research effort on post-attack problems relating to physical environment, radiological recovery through decontamination and other means, and medical and welfare requirements. Approval of the amendment will also permit us to undertake or expand essential systems analyses in the areas of strategic concepts, national vulnerability, alternative civil defense postures, and relationships to active defense measures.

RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

1964 appropriation	$41,250,000
Estimate, 1965 (authorized portion of $265,600,000)	142,300,000
House allowance	19,200,000
Committee recommendation	69,200,000

The committee recommends restoration of $50 million, to provide a total amount of $69,200,000 for research, shelter survey, and marking, which is $73,100,000 below the estimate for authorized programs.

Of the $50 million restoration, $30 million is recommended for procurement of standard shelter provisions for stocking additional shelter spaces; $500,000 is recommended for practical research on portable ventilation kits, to examine all possibilities before setting up a procurement program at what seems to be an excessive cost per unit; $4,500,000 is recommended for water storage equipment; $5 million is recommended for the identification of existing fallout protection in structures such as private home basements and small buildings not previously covered by the national shelter survey; and $10 million is recommended to provide professional community planning services to local governments to help establish a workable shelter system which will include the assignment of individuals to specific shelters.

The committee agrees with the House in providing $10 million for research and development, which is $5 million below the budget estimate.

Authorization for stocking the shelters is recommended by the committee.

The committee recommends deletion of the general provision prohibiting the use of funds for construction of fallout shelters.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both Senators yield back their time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

PROPOSED NEW BUILDING TO HOUSE THE "ARMS OF THE CONGRESS"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for several years we have been concerned about the plight of a number of important independent agencies who have no domiciles they can call their own. They subsist in borrowed space from other departments and are diffused around town, resulting in inefficiencies and in higher costs of operation.

The agencies I have in mind at the moment are the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Members of Congress are continually pressing members of these Commissions, the so-called arms of the Congress, to speed their investigations and decisions and to clean up backlogs of pending cases; but at the same time allowances must be made for the lack of efficiency that must inevitably result from operations in unsatisfactory, sometimes hardly healthful or sanitary, office facilities. And conditions have grown progressively worse over the years as Congress has given these agencies added duties.

Back in 1959, the Senator from Washington asked the General Services Administration to explore the possibility of housing these regulatory agencies in one building, and its preliminary survey indicated a saving of $550,000 annually in rental if just some of the agencies were brought under one roof—to say nothing of greatly improved efficiency and service to the public.

The General Services Administration is cognizant of the situation and is sympathetic. As Mr. Boutin, the Administrator, pointed out at our recent hearings:

> We are extremely in favor of doing this. Some of our regulatory agencies are atrociously housed. We think we can save a great deal of money using common services, common facilities by building a single building to house certain regulatory agencies.

He has assured us that this project is on the list. We hope early priority can be given to it, in the interest of Government efficiency and Government economy and in keeping with the President's program.

Mr. President, because the hour is late, I am sure all of us on the committee, through the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and myself, want to express our deep appreciation to the work of the staff—Mr. Earl Cooper and others—on this very complicated and complex bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think the Senate owes a great debt of gratitude for the knowledge, the courtesy, and the kindness shown by the distinguished Senator from Washington—chairman of the subcommittee—and the ranking minority member [Mr. ALLOTT]. They ren-

dered an outstanding service, and the Senate is better off because of it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the entire staff and to the members of the committee. I think this is the most difficult appropriation bill to come before the Congress. If it were not for a great deal of hard night work and many extra hours, we would not have been able to accomplish the task. I would be very remiss if I did not express my appreciation to the members of the committee and the members of the staff, both minority and majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 11296) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 1237, Senate bill 2048, and that the remainder of the calendar be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIG HORN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2048) to provide for the establishment of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "Big Horn" and insert "Bighorn"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "Proposed", to strike out "Big Horn" and insert "Bighorn"; in line 20, after the word "jurisdiction", to insert "not needed for other Federal programs which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal"; on page 3, line 12, after the word "Secretary.", to insert "(c) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any other law, the Crow Indian Tribe shall have the exclusive right to develop and operate, at no expense to the United States, water-based recreational facilities, including landing ramps, boathouses, and fishing facilities, along that part of the shoreline of Yellowtail Reservoir which is adjacent to lands comprising the Crow Indian Reservation. Any such part so developed shall be administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary. Any revenues resulting from the operation of such facilities may be retained by the Crow Indian Tribe.

"(2) As used in this subsection, the term 'shoreline' means that land owned by the Bureau of Reclamation which borders both Yellowtail Reservoir and the exterior boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, together with that part of the reservoir necessary to the development of such facilities."; and, on page 5, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $320,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir and lands adjacent thereto in the States of Wyoming and Montana by the people of the United States and for preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment of such lands and waters, there is hereby established the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area to comprise the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Proposed Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area", NPMW-018-BC, June 1963, which is on file in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) As soon as practicable after approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the boundaries of the area which shall encompass, to the extent practicable, the lands and waters shown on the drawing referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary may subsequently make adjustments in the boundary of the area, subject to the provisions of subsection 2(b) of this Act, by publication of an amended description in the Federal Register.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretaary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the area. In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the area and convey in exchange therefor any federally owned property under his jurisdiction not needed for other Federal programs which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Any property or interest therein owned by the State of Montana or the State of Wyoming or any political subdivision thereof within the recreation area may be acquired only with the concurrence of the owner.

(b) No part of lands of the Crow Indian Tribe of Montana shall be included within the recreation area unless requested by the council of the tribe. The Indian lands so included may be developed and administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitation specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary. (c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of any other law, the Crow Indian Tribe shall have the exclusive right to develop and operate, at no expense to the United States, water-based recreational facilities, including landing ramps, boathouses, and fishing facilities, along that part of the shoreline of Yellowtail Reservoir which is adjacent to lands comprising the Crow Indian Reservation. Any such part so developed shall be administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary. Any revenues resulting from the operation of such facilities may be retained by the Crow Indian Tribe.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term "shoreline" means that land owned by the Bureau of Reclamation which borders both Yellowtail Reservoir and the exterior boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, together with that part of the reservoir necessary to the development of such facilities.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall coordinate administration of the recreation area with the other purposes of the Yellowtail Reservoir project so that it will in his judgment best provide (1) for public outdoor recreation benefits, (2) for conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment, and (3) for management, utilization, and disposal of renewable natural resources in a manner that promotes, or is compatible with, and does not significantly impair, public recreation and conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, or other values contributing to public enjoyment.

(b) In the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Appropriate user fees may be collected notwithstanding any limitation on such authority by any provision of law.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreation area in accordance with the appropriate laws of the States of Montana or Wyoming to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the Montana Fish and Game Department or the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $320,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, S. 2048, to create the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area in south-central Montana and north-central Wyoming is one of the most important recreation development bills to come before the Congress this year. Its passage and prompt development of the area is most important in light of the progress on Yellowtail Dam and the flooding of the area which will begin soon.

S. 2048 would set aside some 63,300 acres along the Big Horn River above Yellowtail Dam as a unit of the national park system. The area would include the spectacular Big Horn Canyon, some 47 miles long with cliffs rising 800 to 2,200 feet above the river. It would cover about one-third of the 195-mile shoreline created by the Yellowtail Reservoir.

In addition to the impressive scenery and geology presented in the canyon, there are sites of significant archeological and historical interest. The Smithsonian Institution is studying a narrow strip of land running the length of the canyon, on which have been found evidence of habitation by an unknown prehistoric tribe. Near the damsite are the remains of old Fort C. F. Smith, an Army infantry post established in 1866 to protect travelers on the Bozeman Trail from the Sioux and Cheyenne Indians.

Other proposed recreation facilities are:

First. A major development at Yellowtail Dam, including a visitor center, administrative headquarters, the dam overlook and scenic drive, boat excursion facilities, campgrounds, picnic areas, loading and eating facilities.

Second. Dry Head—minor—development, with camp and picnic grounds accessible only by boat.

Third. Barrys landing—major—development with boat launching facilities, lodging and eating places, camp and picnic grounds, horse corral and riding and hiking trails.

Fourth. Devils Canyon—minor—developments including archeological and geological exhibits, hiking and riding trails and overlook.

Fifth. Horshoe Bend, outside the canyon where the reservoir will be wider and shallower. In addition to the usual facilities, there will be a swimming beach.

Sixth. Kane Bridge development including campgrounds and picnic area, boat launching site and information station.

Development, over a 10-year period, will include a highway down the west side of the reservoir, linking Interstate Highway 90 near Hardin with Wyoming State 14 near Lovell. From this highway there would be access to the recreation area at several points.

Boundaries of the proposed recreation area have been carefully drawn to avoid including private lands not absolutely necessary. All but about one-ninth of the land involved is already in Federal ownership. Within the area, more than 29,200 acres are being acquired by the Bureau of Reclamation for dam and reservoir purposes. Of the remainder, almost 27,000 acres are in the Federal land reserve. There are some 719 acres of Montana State lands, which under S. 2048 can only be acquired with the concurrence of the State. Some 6,418 acres are privately owned—4,560 acres in Montana and 1,858 in Wyoming.

The proposal does not include any lands owned by the Crow Indian Tribe, although the Crow Reservation will border about two-thirds of the Yellowtail Reservoir.

Addition of certain of these Indian lands would greatly enhance the recreation area, but they will not be included without the consent of the tribe. The Crow Indian Tribe will have the exclusive right to develop and operate water-based recreational facilities, including landing ramps, boathouses, and fishing facilities, along that part of the shoreline of Yellowtail Reservoir which is adjacent to lands comprising the Crow Indian Reservation. Any such development will be administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary. Revenues thereby produced will be retained by the Crow Tribe.

Private concessions will also be encouraged. There will be a need for a variety of lodges, cabins, trailer villages, and eating facilities. The Crow Indian Tribe can develop many of these concessions if they decide to participate in the recreation plan.

The Park Service estimates the acquisition and development cost at $7.7 million. When full recreation use is reached, the Park Service states that the Government can expect annual monetary benefits of at least $1,011,600.

The Park Service also estimates the regional recreation use alone at 154,000 visitor days annually by 1970 if full-scale development is carried through. Total use, including tourists from points outside a 100-mile radius would bring the visitor day annual total to 562,000.

The proposed Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area is situated in one of our Nation's major vacation lands. It is only 110 miles east of our oldest and largest national park, Yellowstone, which last year attracted 1,872,500 visits. It is not too far distant from Glacier National Park in western Montana. It is just a short drive from the Custer Battlefield. It is near well-traveled vacation routes, such as U.S. Highways 87 and 212 and Interstate 90, now under construction, to the north and east. Wyoming State Highway 14 will also provide access to the area from the south.

Since this is the only proposed reservoir national recreation area in the Missouri River Basin, it would serve the water-oriented recreation needs of thousands of people from the Rocky Mountain region and the Great Plains.

Mr. President, Montana has a great many resources which have not been developed such as this recreational area. If Montana is to do its part in providing for the phenomenal recreational needs of the future development of these areas it must be accomplished now. I, therefore, sincerely urge the passage of S. 2048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK IN MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The bill (H.R. 9521) to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1302), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 9521, is to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. This legislation would increase by $120 million the appropriation limitation for that portion of the Missouri River Basin project which is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior. The authorization is confined to appropriations for fiscal years 1965 and 1966 and is further qualified by language prohibiting the appropriation of any of the funds to initiate construction of units of the Missouri River Basin project not hereafter authorized or reauthorized by the Congress.

EXPLANATION

The Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) authorized the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a portion of the comprehensive plan for development of the Missouri River Basin, and section 9(e) of that act authorized the appropriation of $200 million for partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary. Subsequent authorizations have increased this appropriation limitation to a total of $826 million. Against this amount, net allotments to projects as of June 30, 1963, amounts to $783,775,646. Adding the fiscal year 1964 appropriation of $64,870,600 leaves a balance as of June 30, 1964, of $22,353,754. The amount of this balance plus the $120 million which would be authorized by H.R. 9521 would meet the Department's estimated fund needs for continuing construction during fiscal years 1965 and 1966. The Department's fund needs, totaling about $141,161,000, are set out in the following tabulation:

List of Missouri River Basin units and amounts estimated to be obligated, fiscal years 1965 and 1966

Unit or activity	Estimated fiscal year 1965 obligation program	Estimated fiscal year 1965 obligation program
Ainsworth	$6,500,000	$5,340,000
Almena	2,650,000	930,000
East Bench	780,000	190,000
Farwell	2,700,000	2,035,000
Frenchman-Cambridge	665,000	470,000
Glen Elder	8,400,000	24,400,000
Transmission division	22,175,000	17,955,000
Yellow tail	19,950,000	17,350,000
Investigations	1,743,000	1,828,300
Advance planning	950,000	1,211,000
Angostura	232,000	32,000
Bostwick	555,000	448,000
Cedar Buff	100,000	121,000
Crow Creek pump	20,000	5,335
Glendo	249,000	
Hanover-Bluff	225,000	150,000
Helena Valley	150,000	100,000
Kirwin	94,000	
Oahe-James section	100,000	
Owl Creek	40,000	
Shadehill	15,000	115,000
Technical records and as-built drawings	15,000	15,000
Webster	120,000	37,000
Total	68,428,000	72,732,635
Total, fiscal years 1965 and 1966	141,160,635	

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 5, 1964

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $500,000.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency Planning, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of the Office; (1) ~~$4,285,000~~ *$4,855,000*: *Provided,* That not to exceed (2) ~~$250,000~~ *$600,000* of the foregoing amount shall remain available until expended for studies and research to

develop measures and plans for (3)*emergency preparedness and* telecommunications.

STATE AND LOCAL PREPAREDNESS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop State and local programs for the effective use in time of war of natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, $4,190,000.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and Technology, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates

for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, (4)~~$880,000~~ *$950,000.*

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Defense

operation and maintenance

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, (5)~~$70,000,000~~ *$85,000,000,* of which not to exceed (6)~~$15,000,000~~ *$17,000,000* shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended(7)~~, and not to exceed $13,500,000 shall be available for management~~

~~expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions.~~

RESEARCH, SHELTER SURVEY AND MARKING

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense, and for continuing shelter surveys (8)~~and marking,~~ *marking and stocking,* (9)~~$19,200,000~~ *$69,200,000,* to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the limitations on apropriations contained in Section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260).

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for civil defense activities.

(10)~~No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters.~~

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service

EMERGENCY HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for carrying out emergency planning and preparedness functions of the Public Health Service, and procurement, storage (including underground storage), distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense medical supplies and equipment authorized by section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., App. 2281(h)), (11) ~~$8,500,000~~ *$9,250,000*, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; (12) ~~$10,440,000~~ *$10,775,000*.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, including not to exceed (13)~~$3,000,000~~ *$4,300,000* for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, (14)~~$79,000,000~~ *$86,124,000*, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $90,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; (15)~~$21,805,000~~

$22,187,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $600,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual

transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775), $1,650,000.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3006), $10,650,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $1,138,000 of the funds in the "Employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001–3014), including services as

authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS, RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C. 3053), $14,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, without regard to the provisions of any other Act, not to exceed $348,000 of the funds in the "Retired employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3051–3060), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the estimated cost of new and increased annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided by Part III of Public Law 87–793 (76 Stat. 868), $65,000,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed (16)~~$270,000~~ *$277,000* of the funds in the "Employees life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided,* That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, (17)~~the continuation of the existing authorized domestic flight service stations,~~ and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed $10,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; purchase of (18)~~twelve~~ *sixteen* passenger motor vehicles, including (19)~~eight~~ *twelve* for replacement only; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; (20)~~$537,600,000~~ *$544,*-

100,000: *Provided,* That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed (21)~~$6,000,000~~ *$6,344,000* or include in excess of (22)~~396~~ *406* positions: *Provided further,* That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska) ; and purchase of eight aircraft; (23)~~$50,000,000~~ *$66,000,000,* to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities: *Provided further,* That no part of the

foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel(24): *Provided further, That the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized to reimburse the unincorporated town of Battle Mountain, Nevada, not to exceed $3,500 for the cost of road improvements abutting Government-owned property in Battle Mountain, Nevada.*

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

For grants-in-aid for airports pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, as follows: for the purposes of section 5 (d) (4) of such Act: $66,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; for the purposes of section 5 (d) (5) of such Act, $1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; and for the purposes of section 5 (d) (6) of such Act, $7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing in accordance

with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301–1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, (25)~~$21,000,000~~ *$42,000,000*, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; (26)~~$3,530,000~~ *$3,600,000*.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for police type use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $4,319,000.

CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, (27)~~$1,620,000~~ *$1,800,000*, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Dulles International Airport, $180,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Money hereafter recovered from the pool and fountain at Dulles International Airport shall not be subject to the Act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484m, 485a), and may be given to a nonprofit organization which, in the determination of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, promotes and provides for the welfare of travelers in air commerce.

(28) *Funds appropriated under this or any other Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Agency may be ex-*

pended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Agency, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed $85,400), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $14,500), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only (29)~~$16,310,000~~ *$16,460,000.*

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, (30)~~$12,180,000~~ *$12,699,000.*

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, (31)~~$12,725,000~~ *$13,025,000*: *Provided,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for an economic questionnaire or financial study of intercorporate relations.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests

therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; (32)~~$213,800,000~~ *$224,570,000*: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other removable facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its function of protecting the person of the President of the United States and his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President pursuant to title 18, U.S.C. 3056 (33)~~: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year~~.

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding

of sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; $90,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration shall be considered to be public buildings.

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct and acquire public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of $200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including (34) *fallout shelters therein and* equipment for such buildings, (35) ~~$151,722,000~~ *$161,247,500*; and not to exceed $500,000 of this amount shall be available to the Administrator for construction or alteration of small public buildings outside the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary, all to remain

available until expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

Federal office building, Centre, Alabama, (36)~~$144,800~~ *$152,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cullman, Alabama, (37)~~$417,200~~ *$440,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Vernon, Alabama, (38)~~$169,900~~ *$179,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hope, Arkansas, (39)~~$311,700~~ *$329,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Marshall, Arkansas, (40)~~$178,100~~ *$188,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, McCrory, Arkansas, (41)~~$91,800~~ *$96,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mountain Home, Arkansas, (42)~~$179,800~~ *$189,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Blythe, California, (43)~~$306,300~~ *$323,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Del Mar, California, (44)~~$146,000~~ *$154,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Harbor City, California, (45)~~$152,500~~ *$160,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Jackson, California, (46)~~$255,600~~ *$269,800*;

Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, in addition to the sum heretofore provided, (47)~~$2,572,200~~ *$2,715,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Solana Beach, California, (48)~~$146,000~~ *$154,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Weed, California, (49)~~$126,700~~ *$133,750*;

Federal office building, West Los Angeles, California, (50)~~$13,101,300~~ *$13,932,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, (51)~~$312,100~~ *$329,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Leadville, Colorado, (52)~~$176,400~~ *$186,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor Locks, Connecticut, (53)~~$240,700~~ *$254,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cross City, Florida, (54)~~$141,700~~ *$149,550*;

Post office and Federal office building, Oakland Park Branch, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, (55)~~$152,800~~ *$161,300*;

Federal office building, Jacksonville, Florida, (56)~~$6,266,300~~ *$6,731,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gratigny Branch, Miami, Florida, (57)~~$204,400~~ *$215,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Ocoee, Florida, (58)~~$124,300~~ *$131,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Acworth, Georgia, (59)~~$127,000~~ *$134,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Chatsworth, Georgia, (60)~~$208,400~~ *$219,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Toccoa, Georgia, (61)~~$282,600~~ *$298,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Warm Springs, Georgia (62)~~$70,200~~ *$74,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Arthur, Illinois, (63)~~$110,600~~ *$116,750*;

Federal office building, East St. Louis, Illinois, (64)~~$773,700~~ *$853,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Edwardsville, Illinois, (65)~~$342,900~~ *$361,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Red Bud, Illinois, (66)~~$94,600~~ *$99,850*;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, (67)~~$1,900,800~~ *$2,087,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, (68)~~$1,542,600~~ *$1,700,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Scottsburg, Indiana, (69)~~$232,900~~ *$245,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Shoals, Indiana, (70)~~$119,700~~ *$126,350*;

Federal office building, Des Moines, Iowa, (71)~~$7,931,700~~ *$8,491,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Scott City, Kansas, (72)~~$281,000~~ *$296,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Wellington, Kansas, (73)~~$259,200~~ *$273,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Clinton, Kentucky, (74)~~$185,300~~ *$195,600*;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Covington, Kentucky, (75)~~$3,438,000~~ *$3,629,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cumberland, Kentucky, (76)~~$102,200~~ *$107,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Olive Hill, Kentucky, (77)~~$148,400~~ *$156,650*;

Post office and Federal office building, Paris, Kentucky, (78)~~$218,100~~ *$230,200*;

Federal office building, Richmond, Kentucky, (79)~~$160,800~~ *$169,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Russell Springs, Kentucky, (80)~~$86,100~~ *$90,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, (81)~~$3,393,000~~ *$3,675,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Crowley, Louisiana, (82)~~$303,500~~ *$320,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gueydan, Louisiana, (83)~~$101,600~~ *$106,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mamou, Louisiana, (84)~~$72,000~~ *$76,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mansura, Louisiana, (85)~~$80,300~~ *$84,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Oberlin, Louisiana, (86)~~$97,400~~ *$102,800*;

Post office and courthouse, Opelousas, Louisiana, (87)~~$903,600~~ *$1,004,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Thibodaux, Louisiana (88)~~$263,500~~ *$278,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Calais, Maine, (89)~~$278,200~~ *$293,650*;

Post office and Federal office building, Lubec, Maine, (90)~~$104,500~~ *$110,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Machias, Maine, (91)~~$220,600~~ *$232,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Centreville, Maryland, (92)~~$205,000~~ *$217,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, North East, Maryland, (93)~~$114,800~~ *$121,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Prince Frederick, Maryland, (94)~~$185,900~~ *$196,250*;

Central heating plant, Suitland, Maryland, (95)~~$3,213,000~~ *$3,341,500*;

General Services Administration, Federal records center, Boston, Massachusetts, (96)~~$883,800~~ *$932,900*;

Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Boston-Lawrence area, Massachusetts, (97)~~$3,748,500~~ *$3,956,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Marlboro, Massachusetts, (98)~~$242,800~~ *$256,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Milford, Massachusetts, (99)~~$274,600~~ *$289,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, (100)~~$2,704,500~~ *$2,954,750*;

Internal Revenue Service National Administrative Service Center and Regional Training Center Building, Detroit, Michigan, (101)~~$2,925,000~~ *$3,087,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Lawton, Michigan, (102)~~$89,000~~ *$93,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mancelona, Michigan, (103)~~$94,100~~ *$99,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Baudette, Minnesota, (104)~~$159,700~~ *$168,550*;

Courthouse and Federal office building, St. Paul, Minnesota, (105)~~$8,993,300~~ *$9,620,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Bay Springs, Mississippi, (106)~~$154,800~~ *$163,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Coldwater, Mississippi, (107)~~$83,500~~ *$88,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Port Gibson, Mississippi, (108)~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Richton, Mississippi, (109)~~$80,700~~ *$85,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Branson, Missouri, (110)~~$142,200~~ *$150,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Crystal City, Missouri, (111)~~$125,900~~ *$132,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Montgomery City, Missouri, (112)~~$248,000~~ *$261,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Fullerton, Nebraska, (113)~~$178,700~~ *$188,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gothenburg, Nebraska (114)~~$147,800~~ *$156,000*;

Post office and courthouse, Carson City, Nevada, (115)~~$1,889,100~~ *$2,061,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Berlin, New Hampshire, (116)~~$317,000~~ *$334,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Avenel, New Jersey, (117)~~$133,200~~ *$140,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Burlington, New Jersey, (118)~~$261,800~~ *$276,350*;

Federal office building, Newark, New Jersey, (119)~~$12,121,200~~ *$12,903,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Raton, New Mexico, (120)~~$319,000~~ *$336,900*;

Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, (121)~~$11,034,900~~ *$11,758,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Keeseville, New York, (122)~~$106,100~~ *$112,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Andrews, North Carolina, (123)~~$105,100~~ *$110,950*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cary, North Carolina, (124)~~$111,600~~ *$117,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Jacksonville, North Carolina, (125)~~$274,700~~ *$289,950*;

Federal office building, Kinston, North Carolina, (126)~~$164,300~~ *$173,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mars Hill, North Carolina, (127)~~$101,700~~ *$107,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Raeford, North Carolina, (128)~~$226,900~~ *$239,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Rich Square, North Carolina, (129)~~$87,300~~ *$92,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Waynesville, North Carolina, (130)~~$401,000~~ *$423,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Windsor, North Carolina, (131)~~$151,100~~ *$159,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hillsboro, Ohio, (132)~~$337,300~~ *$356,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Mantua, Ohio, (133)~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Afton, Oklahoma, (134)~~$107,300~~ *$113,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Elk City, Oklahoma, (135)~~$222,400~~ *$234,750*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hugo, Oklahoma, (136)~~$269,500~~ *$284,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Jay, Oklahoma, (137)~~$174,800~~ *$184,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Baker, Oregon, (138)~~$1,117,800~~ *$1,238,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Enterprise, Oregon, (139)~~$195,900~~ *$206,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Prineville, Oregon, (140)~~$252,300~~ *$266,300*;

Post office and Federal office building, Scappoose, Oregon, (141)~~$125,700~~ *$132,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Berwick, Pennsylvania, (142)~~$267,800~~ *$282,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Brookeville, Pennsylvania, (143)~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Dallas, Pennsylvania, (144)~~$151,700~~ *$160,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Duncannon, Pennsylvania, (145)~~$92,300~~ *$97,400*;

Post office and Federal office building, Falls Creek, Pennsylvania, (146) ~~$96,700~~ *$102,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Galeton, Pennsylvania, (147)~~$119,500~~ *$126,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Hawley, Pennsylvania, (148)~~$151,700~~ *$160,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Irwin, Pennsylvania, (149)~~$224,400~~ *$236,850*;

Post office and Federal office building, Montrose, Pennsylvania, (150)~~$151,700~~ *$160,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, New Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, (151)~~$154,400~~ *$163,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Cedarhurst Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, (152)~~$182,300~~ *$192,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Green Tree Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, (153)~~$182,300~~ *$192,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Pleasant Hills Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, (154)~~$182,300~~ *$192,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Youngsville, Pennsylvania, (155)~~$96,700~~ *$107,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Humacao, Puerto Rico, (156)~~$181,300~~ *$191,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Olneyville Station, Providence, Rhode Island, (157)~~$235,300~~ *$248,350*;

Post office and Federal office building, Elloree, South Carolina, (158)~~$87,400~~ *$92,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Ridgeland, South Carolina, (159)~~$246,500~~ *$260,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Williston, South Carolina, (160)~~$91,800~~ *$96,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Oneida, Tennessee, (161)~~$131,800~~ *$139,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, Buffalo, Texas, (162)~~$86,000~~ *$90,800*;

Post office and Federal office building, Carthage, Texas, (163)~~$235,600~~ *$248,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Fairfield, Texas, (164)~~$168,700~~ *$178,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gonzales, Texas, (165)~~$224,000~~ *$236,450*;

Post office and Federal office building, Naples, Texas, (166)~~$104,100~~ *$109,900*;

Post office and Federal office building, Sulphur Springs, Texas, (167)$279,500 *$295,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, Heber, Utah, (168)~~$161,300~~ *$170,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Provo, Utah, (169)~~$378,000~~ *$399,000*;

Post office and Federal office building, St. Johnsbury, Vermont, (170)~~$335,000~~ *$353,600*;

Franconia warehouse building, Franconia, Virginia, $5,800,000;

Post office and Federal office building, Cle Elum, Washington, (171)~~$120,200~~ *$126,900*;

Federal office building, Colville, Washington, (172)~~$393,200~~ *$415,050*;

Post office and Federal office building, Newport, Washington, (173)~~$136,700~~ *$144,300*;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Spokane, Washington, (174)~~$6,385,500~~ *$6,857,250*;

Federal office building, Vancouver, Washington, (175)~~$426,500~~ *$450,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Gassaway, West Virginia, (176)~~$115,200~~ *$121,600*;

Post office and Federal office building, Glenville, West Virginia, (177)~~$159,300~~ *$168,150*;

Post office and Federal office building, Parsons, West Virginia, (178)~~$171,200~~ *$180,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Pineville, West Virginia, (179)~~$157,500~~ *$166,250*;

Post office and Federal office building, Summersville, West Virginia, (180)~~$232,200~~ *$245,100*;

Post office and Federal office building, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, (181)~~$129,300~~ *$136,500*;

Post office and Federal office building, Eagle River, Wisconsin, (182)~~$152,700~~ *$161,200*;

Post office and Federal office building, Elroy, Wisconsin, (183)~~$113,400~~ *$119,700*;

Post office and Federal office building, Horicon, Wisconsin, (184)~~$120,800~~ *$127,500*;

Housing and Home Finance Agency building, District of Columbia, (185)~~$26,027,100~~ *$27,554,050*:

Provided further, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum: *Provided further*, That the amount of $840,300 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1961 and 1962, for projects at Vanceboro, Maine, Pembina, North Dakota, and Wyandotte, Michigan, is hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation, and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the Post Office and Federal office building at Augusta, Maine, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, is hereby increased by $460,000 (186)*and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the border station facility at Derby Line, Vermont, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962, is hereby increased by $183,000.*

(187)*Not to exceed 120,000 heretofore appropriated under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects", in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, may be*

transferred to the appropriation for "Construction, United States Mission Building, New York, New York", for the payment of contractor's claims.

(188) *SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS*

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, $33,200,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), $9,885,000.

EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FACILITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to provide, directly or indirectly, additional space for the United States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and furnishings; $1,030,600.

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system (including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and other supply management and related activities, as authorized by law, (189)~~$48,920,000,~~ *$52,420,000.*

OPERATING EXPENSES, UTILIZATION AND DISPOSAL SERVICE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property, and rehabilitation of personal property, as authorized by law, $9,512,500, to be derived from proceeds from the transfer of excess property and the disposal of surplus property.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, (190)~~$14,955,000~~ *$15,155,000,* including $25,000 which shall be available for continuing to carry out the pur-

poses of section 2 of Public Law 88–195 approved December 11, 1963, for the period ending June 30, 1965.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation, communications, and other public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, (191) ~~$5,465,000~~ *$5,765,000*.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h), during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), not to exceed $1,500,000 for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including reimbursement for security guard serv-

ices, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed (192) ~~$2,875,000~~ *$3,000,000* for operating expenses, $17,755,000, to be derived from sales of strategic and critical materials: *Provided,* That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Act provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further,* That any receipts from sales during the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury except as otherwise provided herein: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and, after

compliance with the disposal requirements of section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, excess materials in the national stockpile established pursuant to that Act, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, ~~(193)~~ ~~$1,505,000~~ *$1,530,000*: *Provided,* That not to exceed $500 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (78 Stat. 153), $400,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $310,000: *Provided,* That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to

carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund: *Provided,* That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further,* That the total amount deposited into said account for the current fiscal year from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed (194)~~$19,565,000~~ *$21,840,000*: *Provided further,* That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

(195)*WORKING CAPITAL FUND*

To increase the capital of the working capital fund established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), $100,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)

cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Appropriations to the General Services Administration under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" made in this Act shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth

under that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administra-

tion for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose space for any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies at an estimated cost of construction in excess of $200,000 or for the payment of the salary of any person who executes such a lease agreement: *Provided*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for the lease construction of space has been submitted to and approved by the appropriate Committees of the Congress in the same manner as for public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles (196)*including one at not to exceed $4,000 and one* for replacement only; (197)~~$15,525,000~~ *$15,925,000*: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year non-administrative expenses, as defined by law (77 Stat. 437), shall not exceed (198)~~$3,250,000~~ *$3,500,000*.

Urban Planning Grants

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $2,350,000.

Urban Studies and Housing Research

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, $387,400.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, MASS TRANSPORTATION DEMONSTRATIONS

For necessary expenses in connection with mass transportation demonstration projects, as authorized by section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $100,000.

OPEN SPACE LAND GRANTS

For expenses in connection with grants to aid in the acquisition of open-space land or interests therein, and with the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), $15,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $262,000 may be used for administrative expenses and technical assistance, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with grants requiring payments in excess of the amount herein appropriated therefor.

(199) *ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATIONS*

For necessary expenses in connection with low income housing demonstration projects, as authorized by section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, $50,000.

PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), $1,000,000, together with such additional sums not to exceed $3,000,000 as may be necessary to restore to said

revolving fund the amounts which are not required to be repaid pursuant to section 702 (g) of the Housing Act of 1954, as added by section 6 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (40 U.S.C. 462g), to be immediately available.

URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $200,000,000.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), $25,000,000.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), $200,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, (200)~~$15,484,000~~ *$16,084,000*, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; and purchase of not to exceed (201)~~thirty-six~~ *thirty-eight* passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; (202)~~$25,260,000~~ *$25,710,000,* of which not less than $1,889,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $1,261,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided,* That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

(203)*NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION*

(204)*RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT*

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development

activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration $4,413,594,000, to remain available until expended.

(205) *CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES*

For advance planning, design, and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $262,880,500, to remain available until expended.

(206) *ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS*

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; purchase or hire of not to exceed two aircraft for administrative use; maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase and hire of motor vehicles (including purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which forty shall be for replacement only); and maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; $623,525,500.

(207) *GENERAL PROVISIONS*

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Acronautics and Space Adminis-

tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

(208) *No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without the consent of the Congress.*

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Operation and Maintenance of Properties

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, $37,000: *Provided,* That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further,* That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing

Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (209) *purchase of one aircraft; maintenance and operation of aircraft;* hire of passenger motor vehicles (210) *and aircraft;* not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $420,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended

(7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the government for research without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $2,600,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $14,680,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);

(211) *hire of motor vehicles;* purchase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $38,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; (212) ~~$39,440,000~~ *$40,578,000: Provided,* That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for and recognition of war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; reimbursement of the Department of the Army for the services of the officer assigned to the Veterans Administration to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; (213) ~~$155,000,000~~ *$155,250,000*: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further,* That no part of

this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, as authorized by law (214) ~~$14,200,000~~ *$14,500,000*.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, (215) ~~$36,000,000~~ *$38,000,000*, of which (216) ~~$1,170,000~~ *$1,275,000* shall be for prosthetic research and development activities.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational

articles and facilities; maintenance, operation and acquisition of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of eighty-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code; $1,115,935,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, burial flags, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' re-

tirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, and for payment of amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C. 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions of 38 U.S.C. 351, $3,963,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as saved from repeal by section 12 (a) of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1264), and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, (217) ~~$34,600,000~~ *$39,600,000*, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, $13,700,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, (218) ~~$91,233,000~~ *$98,733,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Texas, is reduced from "$2,000,000" to "$1,990,000".

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, $310,000.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses (219) ~~, but not to ex-~~

~~eeed~~ ~~$257,000,000,~~ for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided,* That the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses(220): *Provided further, That, in addition, not to exceed $200,000,000 of unobligated balances of said Direct loans revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amount as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.*

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall

be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

The appropriation available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in

the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board, to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new

offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation of Administrative and Nonadministrative Expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Not to exceed a total of (221) ~~$3,670,000~~ *$3,825,000* shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which may procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and contracts for such services with one organization may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances therefor in accordance with the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.

2131–2133), and said amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided,* That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 6(i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further,* That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be en-

titled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further,* That expenses of any functions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449) : *Provided further,* That the nonadministrative expenses (except those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed $13,120,000 for not to exceed 1,000 positions.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $225,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and

shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730a).

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, College Housing Loans

Not to exceed $1,900,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the

Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed $1,220,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $110,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the

case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Not to exceed $915,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed $8,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual

basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed (222)~~$9,000,000~~

$10,375,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed $1,500): *Provided further,* That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed (223) ~~$75,000,000~~ *$78,750,000.*

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433), including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggre-

gate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed $1,420,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-

sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1965".

Passed the House of Representatives May 21, 1964.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments August 5, 1964.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

88TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11296

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 5, 1964

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C. 20250
Official business Postage and fees paid
U. S. Department of Agriculture

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued Aug. 12, 1964
For actions of Aug. 11, 1964
88th-2nd, No. 156

CONTENTS

Alaska centennial.....4
Appropriations.13,14,15,27
ASC committeemen.....8
Broom imports.....18
Census.....36
Coffee imports.....17
Community development...10
Consumers.....28
Containers.....27
Crop insurance.....6
Disaster relief.....34
Expositions.....4,5
Farm labor..... 20,37
Farm loans.....11
Flood control.....38
Food additives.....21
Food stamps.....1
Foreign aid.....23,29
Forestry.....39
Fruits and vegetables...27
Hay.....34
Housing loans.....24
Information.....12
Lands.....26,39
Loans.....24
Meat imports.....2
Military construction...15
National parks.....11
Opinion poll.....33
Peanuts.....31
Poverty.....22,32
Public Law 480.....3
Recreation.....19,25,26,30
Research.....31
Safety standards.....27
Seed-screening.....7
Taxation.....16
Trade, foreign.....2,17,18
Vehicles.....27
Water resources.....9,35
Weather Bureau.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: House concurred in Senate version of food-stamp bill. Meat-imports bill was sent to conference. House committee reported Public Law 480 bill. Senate concurred in House amendment to poverty bill. Senate debated foreign-aid authorization bill.

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 10222, to provide specific statutory authority for a food stamp plan. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 18325-8

2. MEAT IMPORTS. Voted to request a conference on H. R. 1839, the meat imports bill. House and Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 18311-25, 18452

3. PUBLIC LAW 480. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12298, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (H. Rept. 1767). p. 18390

4. ALASKA CENTENNIAL. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 49, to provide for establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission to study and report on the extent to which the U. S. should participate in the Alaska centennial celebration in 1967 (H. Rept. 1733). p. 18389

5. EXPOSITIONS. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 952, authorizing the President to call upon the States and foreign countries to participate in the International Exposition for southern Calif. (H. Rept. 1737). p. 18390

The Foreign Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11707, to provide for U. S. participation in the Canadian Universal International Exposition (H. Rept. 1738). p. 18390

6. CROP INSURANCE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 277, to authorize extension of crop insurance to 150 additional counties per year rather than 100, as now provided (H. Rept. 1740). p. 18390

7. SEED-SCREENING IMPORTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 3607, to amend the Federal Seed Act so as to limit the importation of seed screenings (H. Rept. 1742). p. 18390

8. ASC COMMITTEEMEN. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9178, to limit terms and provide for staggered terms of ASC committeemen (H. Rept. 1743). p. 18390

9. WATER RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5118, to authorize the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. (H. Rept. 1747). p. 18390

The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 9752, to preserve jurisdiction over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colo. River below Glen Canyon Dam. p. 18390

10. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5406, to authorize this Department to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas (H. Rept. 1757). p. 18390

11. FARM LOANS; NATIONAL PARK. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8290, to authorize addition of certain FHA-foreclosed lands to the Everglades National Park, Fla. (H. Rept. 1758). p. 18390

12. INFORMATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 9586, to provide for establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in development of the arts, including photography and motion pictures. p. 18390

13. D. C. APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 10199 (H. Rept. 1732). pp. 18268-9

14. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 11296. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 18271

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, now that we are able to evaluate more positively the events of Tonkin Gulf, it is increasingly obvious that the United States gained significantly in world standing. We must recognize the fact that much of this is due to the courageous manner in which Comdr. Herbert Leakin Ogier, commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Maddox*, reacted when attacked. I sincerely hope appropriate recognition will be given to him by our Government. Commander Ogier is the forthright officer who covered himself with glory and his Nation with honor by a prompt and vigorous response when the *Maddox* was attacked by North Vietnamese gunboats. This was not a case of turning the other cheek; or a halfhearted response. This was the vigorous and effective answer of a powerful nation that knows she is in the right. I congratulate him; I sincerely hope that my Government will properly honor him so that the world may know we appreciate fighting men who fight.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, EVINS, MAHON, OSTERTAG, and JONAS.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS PROVISIONS VIS-A-VIS BARBERSHOPS AND BEAUTY PARLORS

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the Speaker.)

AUGUST 6, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been brought to our attention by a number of Congressmen that letters and advertisements are being circulated among operators of barbershops and beauty parlors indicating that the recently enacted Civil Rights Act of 1964 will require such establishments to serve Negroes. This suggestion, of course, is completely without foundation. Neither barbershops nor beauty parlors are covered by the public accommodations provisions of the new law, except in those particular and limited instances where the barbershop or beauty parlor is located in a hotel or other covered establishment in order to serve patrons of the hotel or other establishment. This coverage, which would extend only to a small minority of barbershops and beauty parlors, is not based on any attempt to cover barbershops or beauty parlors, as such, but on the logical premise that all the services of a covered facility, such as a hotel, should be available to the patrons of the hotel without discrimination.

I hope this information will be helpful to you in dispelling the misconceptions which have been circulated concerning coverage of the new law.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Deputy Attorney General.

REAPPORTIONMENT AND THE CENSUS

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a bill I dropped in the hopper today to authorize that a census of population be taken next year, 1965.

As you all know, the Supreme Court has rendered a number of decisions in recent months directing that the House of Representatives must be reapportioned on the basis of population alone. The Court has also ruled that State legislatures must be reapportioned on the basis of population alone.

I think it is apparent to many of my colleagues that the population in many of our cities has risen sharply since the last census was taken in 1960. How can we possibly be expected to redraw district lines solely on the basis of population if we are forced to use figures 5 years old? If we are to redraw district lines, in compliance with the Supreme Court's decisions, with any degree of accuracy we must have more up-to-date information on the actual population in each area of the country, by State, county, and political subdivision. Unless such information is brought up to date, it will be a waste of time to redraw district lines before 1970 because I am sure we will find at that time that the districts are not equal in population because we used obsolete figures in redistricting.

Our State legislatures will be considering the problem of redistricting next year and the Court has ruled that new district lines, based on population alone, must be drawn before the 1966 elections.

Therefore, I urge the support of all my colleagues to have my bill enacted into law before this Congress adjourns. With the figures obtained in a 1965 census, we will be able to tackle the problem of redistricting in the knowledge that the new lines we draw will be reasonably accurate.

ADVANCE NOTICE OF ATTACK ON NORTH VIETNAM PT BOAT BASES

(Mr. FOREMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, since my expression of concern last Friday before this Congress over the administration's irresponsible action in giving advance notice to the world, including the Communists, of our planned attack upon their North Vietnam PT boat bases, we have had confirmation from both the Pentagon and the White House that the facts and timing I pointed out surrounding this matter are correct.

Further, it is my understanding that, last night, Rear Adm. Robert B. Moore, commander of the task force that led the raids, informed United Press International that our planes had not been detected by the enemy radar at the time of the President's prime television performance. This information further points up the very serious international irresponsibility of such an ill-advised television production by this administration.

Our initial attack upon the enemy was made Wednesday at 1:15 a.m., e.d.t., 99 minutes after the President had told the world of the pending attack. Never before, in recent history, has there been demonstrated such high-level international military irresponsibility.

The Pentagon and the President's awkward attempts to cover up this grandstanding political play only goes to prove how irresponsible the announcement was.

A doughboy soldier notifying the enemy 90 minutes in advance of a raid would be tried for treason, and he could expect grave and serious consequences, but this action is supposed to be rewarded in November at the polls.

In response to questioning by reporters after this was brought to light, the Pentagon and White House advised that we gave early notice so that "Hanoi would know it was a limited response, only," and further so that Americans could be advised of the action by Washington rather than by Hanoi. By this deplorable and unexcusable action, the administration is saying to the mothers and wives of American fighting men, "We are sending your sons and husbands to fight for their country, but we want to give the enemy every advantage, so we'll advise them to have their guns ready to shoot your boys when they arrive."

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 12298.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON OUR NORTH VIETNAM ATTACK

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] who has just addressed the House involves a very serious charge against the great Chief Executive of this country. No President of the United States for political gain would ever do anything or in all the history of this country has ever done anything that would jeopardize the lives of our troops.

The statement that this was done for that purpose is simply untrue.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is—and I have checked this matter out—that the American planes had already been picked up on radar before the President made his report to the American people.

The President knew that the enemies' radar screens had already alerted them to the approach of American planes.

He knew that the enemy was unable to respond and the proof of this has been established beyond any question by the fact that the enemy did not respond and that their PT-type boats were sitting ducks for attack for our aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, the question before the President of the United States was whether the American people should be advised of American action in retaliation to enemy action by the President of the United States speaking from Washington or whether they should have been advised from Hanoi or Peiping.

Mr. Speaker, the President acted responsibly as the President should in performing his duties in the area of great decisions and in informing the American people of action taoken on their behalf.

THE VIETNAM SITUATION AND OUR RETALIATION

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, of course I do not claim to know when the enemy radar picked up the approach of our planes on this very important mission to which the gentleman from Texas has referred and to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has referred.

I recall reading in the papers something to the effect that some of the people who were over there indicated they had been picked up on the radar. But I want to make this contribution, for whatever it is worth.

Last Tuesday afternoon, I received a call to come to the White House at 6:45 p.m. Of course, I indicated I would respond, having had some intimation as to what the meeting might be about.

During the day there had been information that serious attacks had been made on our vessel, the destroyer *Maddox* and on our flag.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure enough has been written and said that this is no disclosure of something that is confidential—my colleagues who go down there from time to time along with the rest of us, recognize that as far as I am concerned my lips are sealed as far as divulging the conversations at these meetings. And I am sure everyone who was there will corroborate my statement in this regard: That we were cautioned before the meeting even got underway that what we were about to hear was a sort of thing which should not be leaked in any fashion because it could serve as advance warning to the enemy. As I said, that admonition was given to us as we opened the meeting and as we closed the meeting.

As I remember it—and I have checked with some others who were there—we were told that nothing should be said about this proposed retaliatory move and no one, not even the President, would say anything about it until our planes were over the targets. Only then, it was said, would the President explain the matter to the people over television and radio.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me highly in order that there be no question about my saying anything in advance of the attack, and I hid out for a couple of hours and did not even answer the telephone when I finally got home.

Mr. Speaker, as to the right and wrong of this whole thing, I do not know, but I am certain that we were all cautioned to an absolute silence and confidence that was implicit in that sort of a meeting, because we did not want anything to get out until the planes were over the targets.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to say now that the Russians could intercept—that anyone could intercept—statements made publicly some hour and a half before the planes were actually over the targets.

Mr. Speaker, I read the explanation of the Secretary of Defense. I have heard the other things that have been said—and as I say except as I know what the facts were in connection with my participation——

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. What the gentleman says regarding the meeting is true. I was present at the meeting and I did exactly what the gentleman from Indiana did. I did not talk to members of the news media or anyone else for that matter until the next morning.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be said that the reason why we were admonished was that the matter of disclosure was a decision for the military and the Executive and not for us who were not in command of the situation.

I think that is a fair statement of the situation. I think it was understood that the President would make a statement when he who had the means of having available the facts determined that the disclosure should be made.

Mr. HALLECK. I accept that except I must insist upon my original statement that the words that were used were "this would be made public when the planes were over the targets."

DECLINE IN CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just requested a special order for 30 minutes for today in order to discuss the very important economic statistic that was recently issued by the Department of Labor, but very much hidden in its press release and certainly not reported by the press and news media to any great extent.

The decline in the civilian labor force from June to July by 400,000 people is a very serious problem suggesting, if unexplained, economic stagnation.

I am going to discuss this under special order today because it requires considerable explanation. The 4.9 percent figure of unemployment proclaimed by the Department of Labor could only come about in the context of a decline in the civilian labor force. I think it is time that the political appointees in the Department of Labor quit juggling the figures and quit trying to draw erroneous conclusions from important economic statistics.

I hope all Members who are interested in the problems of unemployment will be present.

I have already issued a press release on the remarks I am going to make under special order.

THE VIETNAM SITUATION AND OUR RETALIATION

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the really bothersome point in this matter relative to the announcement of the President 99 minutes prior to the occurrence of the reprisal against the North Vietnamese and the followup statement that the American airplanes had been picked up on North Vietnamese radar at the time the announcement was made is that during this period of 1 hour and 39 minutes an American jet airplane with an airspeed of 500 miles an hour could travel about 825 miles. Were they 825 miles away when picked up, or alleged to be picked up by this North Vietnamese radar? If so the North Vietnamese are equipped with radar of very unique and extraordinary range capability.

One the other hand, if the American aircraft were in the air at closer ranges they must have been on varying courses that would not have disclosed their intention to engage in an attack some hour and 39 minutes later, in which event, the President's words actually supplied the initial information to the North Vietnamese of their intention. I think there is serious need for either the President or the Secretary of Defense or preferrably both to come forth with a straightforward explanation for this glaring hole in the explanations they have made so far.

AUTHORIZING POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9653) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

this is no disclosure of something that is confidential—my colleagues who go down there from time to time along with the rest of us, recognize that as far as I am concerned my lips are sealed as far as divulging the conversations at these meetings. And I am sure everyone who was there will corroborate my statement in this regard: That we were cautioned before the meeting even got underway that what we were about to hear was a sort of thing which should not be leaked in any fashion because it could serve as advance warning to the enemy. As I said, that admonition was given to us as we opened the meeting and as we closed the meeting.

DECLINE IN CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just requested a special order for 30 minutes for today in order to discuss the very important economic statistic that was recently issued by the Department of Labor, but very much hidden in its press release and certainly not reported by the press and news media to any great extent.

The decline in the civilian labor force

glaring hole in the explanations they have made so far.

AUTHORIZING POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9653) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

House Aug 12, 1964

Passed with amendments S. 502, to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. H. R. 9752, a similar bill which was passed earlier as reported, was tabled. pp. 18598, 18611-2, 18623

13. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. Passed as reported S. 1664, to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the U. S. pp. 18613-23

14. PACIFIC ISLANDS. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 3198, to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 18629

15. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11296 (H. Rept. 1781). pp. 18588-94, ~~18669~~

16. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 11579. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 18575

17. WILDLIFE. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2392, to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with States (H. Rept. 1768). p. 18669

18. FOOD ADDITIVES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12033, to further amend the transitional provisions of the act of 1958 prohibiting the use of food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety (H. Rept. 1770). p. 18669

19. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1712, to authorize the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands (H. Rept. 1778). p. 18669

20. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 8526, amended, relating to the issuance of patents for lands held under color of title, to liberalize the requirements for the conveyance of the mineral estate. p. D682

21. ROADS AND TRAILS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 12289, amended, to establish the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission. p. D683

22. TIME STANDARDS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11483, amended, to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement and to promote the observance of such time standards for all purposes. p. D683

23. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 5376, to provide for the inclusion in computation of accredited service for retirement purposes, of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States; and H. R. 8544, to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and Classification Act of 1949. p. D683

24. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee voted to report to the full committee S. 1466, amended, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies. p. D683

25. APPROPRIATIONS; POVERTY. Received from the President an appropriation estimate for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $947,500,000 to finance the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (H. Doc. 337). p. 18669

26. GUAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee granted an open rule, with 1 hour of debate, on H. R. 3869, to provide technical agricultural assistance to Guam, making it in order to substitute S. 692 in lieu thereof. p. D683

27. COFFEE. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 8864, to implement the International Coffee Agreement. p. D. 684

28. RESEARCH. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 4364, providing for duty-free entry of a mass spectrometer for Oregon State and Wayne State universities. p. D684

29. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Olsen, Mont., expressed his support for sending H. R. 1839, the meat-import restriction bill, to conference, and inserted Rep. Colmer's statement requesting the conference. pp. 18629-31

30. POVERTY. Rep. Williams explained the loyalty-oath amendments he offered to the poverty bill. p. 18631

31. RIVERS AND HARBORS. Rep. Hull inserted resolutions adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. p. 18637

32. APPALACHIA. Rep. Schwengel described a tour he made of the Appalachian region in order to secure first-hand knowledge of the situation, and inserted testimony gathered on the tour. pp. 18658-9

33. HOLIDAY. Rep. Rooney, N. Y., inserted his statement favoring legislation making Columbus Day, Oct. 12, a national holiday. p. 18659

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

34. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Olsen, Minn., inserted an article, "The Human Side of Foreign Aid," which cites the impact our foreign aid is having on the recipient nations. pp. A4266-7

35. WHEAT. Extension of remarks of Rep. Burton inserting a satirical article on the wheat deal with Russia, "Happiness is a Wheat Deal With Hungry Russians." p. A4270

36. POVERTY. Speech in the House by Rep. Burton expressing his support for the poverty bill. p. A4273

37. OPINION POLL. Rep. Cleveland inserted the results of a questionnaire, including items of interest to this Department. pp. A4275-6

BILLS INTRODUCED

38. HEALTH. H. R. 12350, by Rep. Burton, Calif., to provide a program of national health insurance; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

39. PATENTS. H. R. 12354, by Rep. St. Onge, for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code; to Judiciary Committee.

88TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1781

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

AUGUST 12, 1964.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THOMAS, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11296]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 24, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 191, 210, and 214.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 17, 22, 195, 196, 203, 205, 206, 211, and 216, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$4,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

35-006—64——1

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$400,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$900,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$75,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$16,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: , *and not to exceed $14,500,000 shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$30,200,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters except in construction of new buildings under the heading, "Construction, Public Buildings Projects", for the fiscal year 1965.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$8,875,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$10,607,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,358,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$82,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$21,996,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$273,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *fourteen*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *ten*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$542,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$6,200,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$40,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,565,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,710,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$16,385,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,439,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,875,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$219,185,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agreed to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation may be used after January 1, 1965, to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert *fallout shelters (in new buildings only) and*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$153,167,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$13,204,300*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$6,383,300*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$810,700*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,981,800*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,614,600*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$8,050,700*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,487,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$954,600*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,804,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$9,120,300*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,956,100*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,230,200*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$11,145,900*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,176,800*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$6,502,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$26,108,100*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$50,670,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$15,055,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,937,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,517,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$20,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$15,725,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,375,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$25,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$15,784,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 201:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *thirty-seven*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 202:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 202, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$25,485,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$4,363,594,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Insert the matter proposed by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert *purchase, maintenance and operation of one aircraft; hire of one aircraft*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 212:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$40,009,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 213:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$155,125,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$37,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$37,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 218:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$98,103,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: , *but not to exceed $380,000,000,*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,747,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$9,687,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 223:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 223, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$78,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 28, 186, 187, 188, 208, and 220.

ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE L. EVINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY.
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

TITLE I

Executive Office of the President

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,600,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $4,285,000 as proposed by the House and $4,855,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Authorizes $400,000 for research and studies instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Inserts language proposed by the Senate authorizing use of research and study funds for emergency preparedness.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $900,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $880,000 as proposed by the House and $950,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense

CIVIL DEFENSE

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $75,000,000 for operation and maintenance instead of $70,000,000 as proposed by the House and $85,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes $16,000,000 for matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate amended to limit management expenses to $14,500,000 instead of $13,500,000 as proposed by the House and restores House limitation of not to exceed 1,000 positions.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes House language and inserts Senate language as proposed by the Senate concerning marking and stocking of fallout shelters.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $30,200,000 for research, shelter survey, marking and stocking instead of $19,200,000 as proposed by the House and $69,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate prohibiting use of any funds for fallout shelter construction, amended to except new buildings under the General Service Administration for the fiscal year 1965 only.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $8,875,000 for emergency health activities of the Public Health Service instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the House and $9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Independent Offices

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $10,607,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $10,440,000 as proposed by the House and $10,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14: Appropriate $82,500,000 for payments to air carriers instead of $79,000,000 as proposed by the House and $86,124,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have been wrestling many years with continuing subsidies for helicopter service for 3 cities while 39 other cities need it as badly as those that now have it. This is the last money to be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively. The conferees respectfully request the CAB not to include one penny for these three lines in its budget next year. This position is unanimously agreed to by the House conferees and a majority of the conferees of the Senate.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $21,996,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $21,805,000 as proposed by the House and $22,187,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Authorizes $273,500 for administrative expenses of the employees life insurance fund instead of $270,000 as proposed by the House and $277,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Amendment No. 17: Deletes language proposed by the House relating to flight service stations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Authorize purchase of 14 passenger motor vehicles of which 10 are for replacement only instead of purchase of 12 vehicles of which 8 are for replacement as proposed by the House and purchase of 16 vehicles of which 12 are for replacement as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $542,600,000 for operation instead of $537,600,000 as proposed by the House and $544,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22: Authorize $6,200,000 for the total cost of aviation medicine instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,344,000 as proposed by the Senate; and limit the number of positions to 406 as proposed by the Senate instead of 396 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $50,000,000 for facilities and equipment as proposed by the House instead of $66,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes language proposed by the Senate concerning reimbursement for the cost of road improvements.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $40,000,000 for research and development instead of $21,000,000 as proposed by the House and $42,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees recommend that the number of jobs at the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center be reduced and that a larger part of the research be done by private contract. The budget proposes spending over $30,000,000 at the facility, of which $17,500,000 is charged to research and includes costly modernization, which is certainly excessive. In its next budget presentation to the committees, the FAA is respectfully requested to include everything relating to this facility as a separate item so as to give a complete picture of the cost and work performed at this center.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $3,565,000 for operation and maintenance of Washington National Airport instead of $3,530,000 as proposed by the House and $3,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $1,710,000 for construction at Washington National Airport instead of $1,620,000 as proposed by the House and $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $16,385,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $16,310,000 as proposed by the House and $16,460,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Commission has not been living up to many directives in recent years earmarking additional funds for processing applications for licenses in the Bureau of Safety and Special Radio Services. The present backlog is disgraceful and the Commission is directed not to divert any of the employees presently engaged in processing such applications, and to get the work current without further delay.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $12,439,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $12,180,000 as proposed by the House and $12,699,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $12,875,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $12,725,000 as proposed by the House and $13,025,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $219,185,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of $213,800,000 as proposed by the House and $224,570,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate amended to prohibit financing, beginning January 1, 1965, of new or expanded space costs which have not previously been funded by transfer to GSA to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year.

Amendment No. 34: Inserts language proposed by the Senate amended to permit use of funds to provide fallout shelters in new buildings only.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $153,167,000 for construction of public buildings projects instead of $151,722,000 as proposed by the House and $161,247,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Provides $144,800 for Federal office building, Centre, Ala., as proposed by the House instead of $152,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Provides $417,200 for post office and Federal office building, Cullman, Ala., as proposed by the House instead of $440,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Provides $169,900 for post office and Federal office building, Vernon, Ala., as proposed by the House instead of $179,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Provides $311,700 for post office and Federal office building, Hope, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $329,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Provides $178,100 for post office and Federal office building, Marshall, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $188,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Provides $91,800 for post office and Federal office building, McCrory, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $96,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Provides $179,800 for post office and Federal office building, Mountain Home, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $189,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Provides $306,300 for post office and Federal office building, Blythe, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $323,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Provides $146,000 for post office and Federal office building, Del Mar, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $154,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Provides $152,500 for post office and Federal office building, Harbor City, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $160,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Provides $255,600 for post office and Federal office building, Jackson, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $269,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Provides $2,572,200 for Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, as proposed by the House instead of $2,715,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Provides $146,000 for post office and Federal office building, Solana Beach, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $154,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Provides $126,700 for post office and Federal office building, Weed, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $133,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Provides $13,204,300 for Federal office building, West Los Angeles, Calif., instead of $13,101,300 as proposed by the House and $13,932,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Provides $312,100 for post office and Federal office building, Glenwood Springs, Colo., as proposed by the House instead of $329,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Provides $176,400 for post office and Federal office building, Leadville, Colo., as proposed by the House instead of $186,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Provides $240,700 for post office and Federal office building, Windsor Locks, Conn., as proposed by the House instead of $254,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Provides $141,700 for post office and Federal office building, Cross City, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $149,550, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Provides $152,800 for post office and Federal office building, Oakland Park branch, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $161,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides $6,383,300 for Federal office building, Jacksonville, Fla., instead of $6,266,300 as proposed by the House and $6,731,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Provides $204,400 for post office and Federal office building, Gratigny branch, Miami, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $215,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Provides $124,300 for post office and Federal office building, Ocoee, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $131,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Provides $127,000 for post office and Federal office building, Acworth, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $134,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides $208,400 for post office and Federal office building, Chatsworth, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $219,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Provides $282,600 for post office and Federal office building, Toccoa, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $298,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Provides $70,200 for post office and Federal office building, Warm Springs, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $74,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63: Provides $110,600 for post office and Federal office building, Arthur, Ill., as proposed by the House instead of $116,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Provides $810,700 for Federal office building, East St. Louis, Ill., instead of $773,700 as proposed by the House and $853,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 65: Provides $342,900 for post office and Federal office building, Edwardsville, Ill., as proposed by the House instead of $361,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Provides $94,600 for post office and Federal office building, Red Bud, Ill., as proposed by the House instead of $99,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Provides $1,981,800 for courthouse and Federal office building, Evansville, Ind., instead of $1,900,800 as proposed by the House and $2,087,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 68: Provides $1,614,600 for post office and Federal office building, Evansville, Ind., instead of $1,542,600 as proposed by the House and $1,700,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69: Provides $232,900 for post office and Federal office building, Scottsburg, Ind., as proposed by the House instead of $245,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Provides $119,700 for post office and Federal office building, Shoals, Ind., as proposed by the House instead of $126,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71: Provides $8,050,700 for Federal office building, Des Moines, Iowa, instead of $7,931,700 as proposed by the House and $8,491,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72: Provides $281,000 for post office and Federal office building, Scott City, Kans., as proposed by the House instead of $296,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Provides $259,200 for post office and Federal office building, Wellington, Kans., as proposed by the House instead of $273,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Provides $185,300 for post office and Federal office building, Clinton, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $195,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75: Provides $3,438,000 for Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Covington, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $3,629,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Provides $102,200 for post office and Federal office building, Cumberland, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $107,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Provides $148,400 for post office and Federal office building, Olive Hill, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $156,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Provides $218,100 for post office and Federal office building, Paris, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $230,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Provides $160,800 for Federal office building, Richmond, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $169,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80: Provides $86,100 for post office and Federal office building, Russell Springs, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $90,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81: Provides $3,487,000 for post office and Federal office buiding, Baton Rouge, La., instead of $3,393,000 as proposed by the House and $3,675,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82: Provides $303,500 for post office and Federal office building, Crowley, La., as proposed by the House instead of $320,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Provides $101,600 for post office and Federal office building, Gueydan, La., as proposed by the House instead of $106,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Provides $72,000 for post office and Federal office building, Mamou, La., as proposed by the House instead of $76,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 85: Provides $80,300 for post office and Federal office building, Mansura, La., as proposed by the House instead of $84,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86: Provides $97,400 for post office and Federal office building, Oberlin, La., as proposed by the House instead of $102,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87: Provides $954,600 for post office and courthouse, Opelousas, La., instead of $903,600 as proposed by the House and $1,004,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 88: Provides $263,500 for post office and Federal office building, Thibodaux, La., as proposed by the House instead of $278,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 89: Provides $278,200 for post office and Federal office building, Calais, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of $293,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90: Provides $104,500 for post office and Federal office building, Lubec, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of $110,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 91: Provides $220,600 for post office and Federal office building, Machias, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of $232,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 92: Provides $205,000 for post office and Federal office building, Centreville, Md., as proposed by the House instead of $217,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 93: Provides $114,800 for post office and Federal office building, North East, Md., as proposed by the House and $121,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94: Provides $185,900 for post office and Federal office building, Prince Frederick, Md., as proposed by the House instead of $196,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 95: Provides $3,213,000 for central heating plant, Suitland, Md., as proposed by the House instead of $3,341,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96: Provides $883,800 for Federal records center, General Services Administration, Boston, Mass., as proposed by the House instead of $932,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 97: Provides $3,748,500 for Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Boston-Lawrence area, Massachusetts, as proposed by the House instead of $3,956,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 98: Provides $242,800 for post office and Federal office building, Marlboro, Mass., as proposed by the House instead of $256,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99: Provides $274,600 for post office and Federal office building, Milford, Mass., as proposed by the House instead of $289,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100: Provides $2,804,500 for post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Mass., instead of $2,704,500 as proposed by the House and $2,954,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101: Provides $2,925,000 for Internal Revenue Service National Administrative Center and Regional Training Center Building, Detroit, Mich., as proposed by the House instead of $3,087,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 102: Provides $89,000 for post office and Federal office building, Lawton, Mich., as proposed by the House instead of $93,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Provides $94,100 for post office and Federal office building, Mancelona, Mich., as proposed by the House instead of $99,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 104: Provides $159,700 for post office and Federal office building, Baudette, Minn., as proposed by the House instead of $168,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 105: Provides $9,120,300 for courthouse and Federal office building, St. Paul, Minn., instead of $8,993,300 as proposed by the House and $9,620,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 106: Provides $154,800 for post office and Federal office building, Bay Springs, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $163,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 107: Provides $83,500 for post office and Federal office building, Coldwater, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $88,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 108: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, Port Gibson, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 109: Provides $80,700 for post office and Federal office building, Richton, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $85,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides $142,200 for post office and Federal office building, Branson, Mo., as proposed by the House instead of $150,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111: Provides $125,900 for post office and Federal office building, Crystal City, Mo., as proposed by the House instead of $132,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 112: Provides $248,000 for post office and Federal office building, Montgomery City, Mo., as proposed by the House instead of $261,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 113: Provides $178,700 for post office and Federal office building, Fullerton, Nebr., as proposed by the House instead of $188,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 114: Provides $147,800 for post office and Federal office building, Gothenburg, Nebr., as proposed by the House instead of $156,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115: Provides $1,956,100 for post office and courthouse, Carson City, Nev., instead of $1,889,100 as proposed by the House and $2,061,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 116: Provides $317,000 for post office and Federal office building, Berlin, N.H., as proposed by the House instead of $334,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 117: Provides $133,200 for post office and Federal office building, Avenel, N.J., as proposed by the House instead of $140,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Provides $261,800 for post office and Federal office building, Burlington, N.J., as proposed by the House instead of $276,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 119: Provides $12,230,200 for Federal office building, Newark, N.J., instead of $12,121,200 as proposed by the House and $12,903,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120: Provides $319,000 for post office and Federal office building, Raton, N. Mex., as proposed by the House instead of $336,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 121: Provides $11,145,900 for Federal office building, Buffalo, N.Y., instead of $11,034,900 as proposed by the House and $11,758,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Provides $106,100 for post office and Federal office building, Keeseville, N.Y., as proposed by the House instead of $112,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Provides $105,100 for post office and Federal office building, Andrews, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $110,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 124: Provides $111,600 for post office and Federal office building, Cary, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $117,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 125: Provides $274,700 for post office and Federal office building, Jacksonville, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $289,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 126: Provides $164,300 for Federal office building, Kinston, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $173,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 127: Provides $101,700 for post office and Federal office building, Mars Hill, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $107,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 128: Provides $226,900 for post office and Federal office building, Raeford, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $239,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 129: Provides $87,300 for post office and Federal office building, Rich Square, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $92,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 130: Provides $401,000 for post office and Federal office building, Waynesville, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $423,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 131: Provides $151,100 for post office and Federal office building, Windsor, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $159,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 132: Provides $337,300 for post office and Federal office building, Hillsboro, Ohio, as proposed by the House instead of $356,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 133: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, Mantua, Ohio, as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 134: Provides $107,300 for post office and Federal office building, Afton, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $113,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 135: Provides $222,400 for post office and Federal office building, Elk City, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $234,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 136: Provides $269,500 for post office and Federal office building, Hugo, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $284,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 137: Provides $174,800 for post office and Federal office building, Jay, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $184,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 138: Provides $1,176,800 for post office and Federal office building, Baker, Oreg., instead of $1,117,800 as proposed by the House and $1,238,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 139: Provides $195,900 for post office and Federal office building, Enterprise, Oreg., as proposed by the House instead of $206,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 140: Provides $252,300 for post office and Federal office building, Prineville, Oreg., as proposed by the House instead of $266,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 141: Provides $125,700 for post office and Federal office building, Scappoose, Oreg., as proposed by the House instead of $132,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 142: Provides $267,800 for post office and Federal office building, Berwick, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $282,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 143: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, Brookville, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 144: Provides $151,700 for post office and Federal office building, Dallas, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $160,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 145: Provides $92,300 for post office and Federal office building, Duncannon, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $97,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 146: Provides $96,700 for post office and Federal office building, Falls Creek, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $102,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 147: Provides $119,500 for post office and Federal office building, Galeton, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $126,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 148: Provides $151,700 for post office and Federal office building, Hawley, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $160,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 149: Provides $224,400 for post office and Federal office building, Irwin, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $236,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 150: Provides $151,700 for post office and Federal office building, Montrose, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $160,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 151: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, New Bethlehem, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 152: Provides $182,300 for post office and Federal office building, Cedarhurst branch, Pittsburgh, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $192,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 153: Provides $182,300 for post office and Federal office building, Green Tree branch, Pittsburgh, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $192,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 154: Provides $182,300 for post office and Federal office building, Pleasant Hills branch, Pittsburgh, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $192,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 155: Provides $96,700 for post office and Federal office building, Youngsville, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $107,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 156: Provides $181,300 for post office and Federal office building, Humacao, P.R., as proposed by the House instead of $191,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 157: Provides $235,300 for post office and Federal office building, Olneyville Station, Providence, R.I., as proposed by the House instead of $248,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 158: Provides $87,400 for post office and Federal office building, Elloree, S.C., as proposed by the House instead of $92,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 159: Provides $246,500 for post office and Federal office building, Ridgeland, S.C., as proposed by the House instead of $260,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 160: Provides $91,800 for post office and Federal office building, Williston, S.C., as proposed by the House instead of $96,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 161: Provides $131,800 for post office and Federal office building, Oneida, Tenn., as proposed by the House instead of $139,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 162: Provides $86,000 for post office and Federal office building, Buffalo, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $90,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 163: Provides $235,600 for post office and Federal office building, Carthage, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $248,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 164: Provides $168,700 for post office and Federal office building, Fairfield, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $178,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 165: Provides $224,000 for post office and Federal office building, Gonzales, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $236,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 166: Provides $104,100 for post office and Federal office building, Naples, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $109,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 167: Provides $279,500 for post office and Federal office building, Sulphur Springs, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $295,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 168: Provides $161,300 for post office and Federal office building, Heber, Utah, as proposed by the House instead of $170,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 169: Provides $378,000 for post office and Federal office building, Provo, Utah, as proposed by the House instead of $399,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 170: Provides $335,000 for post office and Federal office building, St. Johnsbury, Vt., as proposed by the House instead of $353,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 171: Provides $120,200 for post office and Federal office building, Cle Elum, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $126,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 172: Provides $393,200 for Federal office building, Colville, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $415,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 173: Provides $136,700 for post office and Federal office building, Newport, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $144,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 174: Provides $6,502,500 for courthouse and Federal office building, Spokane, Wash., instead of $6,385,500 as proposed by the House and $6,857,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 175: Provides $426,500 for Federal office building, Vancouver, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $450,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 176: Provides $115,200 for post office and Federal office building, Gassaway, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $121,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 177: Provides $159,300 for post office and Federal office building, Glenville, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $168,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 178: Provides $171,200 for post office and Federal office building, Parsons, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $180,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 179: Provides $157,500 for post office and Federal office building, Pineville, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $166,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 180: Provides $232,200 for post office and Federal office building, Summersville, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $245,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 181: Provides $129,300 for post office and Federal office building, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $136,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 182: Provides $152,700 for post office and Federal office building, Eagle River, Wis., as proposed by the House instead of $161,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 183: Provides $113,400 for post office and Federal office building, Elroy, Wis., as proposed by the House instead of $119,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 184: Provides $120,800 for post Office and Federal office building, Horicon, Wis., as proposed by the House instead of $127,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 185: Provides $26,108,100 for Housing and Home Finance Agency building, District of Columbia, instead of $26,027,100 as proposed by the House and $27,554,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 186 and 187: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 188: Reported in disagreement. The conferees are agreed that they will recommend $20,109,000 for sites and expenses of 37 authorized public buildings projects instead of $33,200,000 for 43 projects as proposed by the Senate. Two projects have been deleted because they have not been authorized and if authorized funds will be forthcoming next year. Four other projects proposed for the District of Columbia have been deleted but will receive early consideration in the bill when submitted next year.

Amendment No. 189: Appropriates $50,670,000 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service instead of $48,920,000 as proposed by the House and $52,420,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 190: Appropriates $15,055,000 for operating expenses of the National Archives and Records Service instead of $14,955,000 as proposed by the House and $15,155,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 191: Appropriates $5,465,000 for operating expenses of the Transportation and Communications Service as proposed by the House instead of $5,765,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 192: Authorizes $2,937,500 for operating expenses, strategic and critical materials, instead of $2,875,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 193: Appropriates $1,517,500 for salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator, instead of $1,505,000 as proposed by the House and $1,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 194: Limits amount which may be deposited into the administrative operations fund to $20,000,000 instead of $19,565,000 as proposed by the House and $21,840,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 195: Appropriates $100,000 to the working capital fund as proposed by the Senate.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 196: Inserts language authorizing purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed $4,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 197: Appropriates $15,725,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator, instead of $15,525,000 as proposed by the House and $15,925,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 198: Authorizes $3,375,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator instead of $3,250,000 as proposed by the House and $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 199: Appropriates $25,000 for administrative expenses, low income housing demonstrations, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 200: Appropriates $15,784,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration instead of $15,484,000 as proposed by the House and $16,084,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 201: Authorizes purchase of 37 passenger motor vehicles instead of 36 as proposed by the House and 38 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 202: Appropriates $25,485,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $25,260,000 as proposed by the House and $25,710,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 203: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204: Appropriates $4,363,594,000 for research and development instead of $4,413,594,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 205: Appropriates $262,880,500 for construction of facilities as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 206: Appropriates $623,525,500 for administrative operations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 207: Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to transfer of funds and funds available to the Administrator amended to delete emergency expense.

Amendment No. 208: Reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Amendments Nos. 209 and 210: Insert language proposed by the Senate amended to authorize purchase, maintenance, and operation of one aircraft, and hire of one aircraft, and delete language proposed by the Senate.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Amendment No. 211: Inserts language proposed by the Senate authorizing hire of motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 212: Appropriates $40,009,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $39,440,000 as proposed by the House and $40,578,000 as proposed by the Senate.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 213: Appropriates $155,125,000 for general operating expenses instead of $155,000,000 as proposed by the House and $155,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 214: Appropriates $14,200,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses as proposed by the House instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 215 and 216: Appropriate $37,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House and $38,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $1,275,000 for prosthetic research as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,170,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 217: Appropriates $37,100,000 for readjustment benefits instead of $34,600,000 as proposed by the House and $39,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 218: Appropriates $98,103,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities instead of $91,233,000 as proposed by the House and $98,733,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $6,870,000 over the House includes funds to convert 2,000 beds for nursing home type patients within the overall 125,000-bed limitation. No funds are included for fallout shelters.

Amendment No. 219: Restores House limitation on funds for property acquisition and other loan guarantee and insurance operations and authorizes $380,000,000 instead of $257,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 220: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendment No. 221: Authorizes $3,747,500 for administrative expenses instead of $3,670,000 as proposed by the House and $3,825,000 as proposed by the Senate. No part of the funds allowed are for printing costs in excess of the amount used in fiscal year 1964.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 222: Authorizes $9,687,500 for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $10,375,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 223: Authorizes $78,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $78,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Albert Thomas,
Joe L. Evins,
George Mahon,
Harold C. Ostertag,
Charles R. Jonas,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has just given us an excellent analysis of the legislation before us today, H.R. 12259.

The prompt, yet thorough, action on this legislation serves to demonstrate the outstanding knowledge and leadership which has continually marked the chairmanship of this subcommittee by my able colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]. His keen awareness and insight into the problems of Cuba and Latin America have enabled the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Affairs to delve into and effectively act on important foreign policy questions.

While this bill provides no compensation, it will enable our citizens to formally prove their claims—looking forward to that day when Castro falls and an agreement for compensation may be worked out with a new government. So, after 5 long years, it can be called the first effective step toward obtaining compensation for our American citizens whose property was arbitrarily taken pursuant to Communist design.

Such determination and proving of claims is long overdue and as more time passes, it will become ever more difficult for claimants to locate the necessary documents and witnesses to establish their claims.

Thus far, the only available recourse open to would-be claimants is a routine filing of their losses with the Department of State. The Department estimates that these now total about $524 million but can go as high as $1.5 billion if all persons losing property in Cuba were to file.

This legislation makes possible a formal procedure whereby all claimants will have the opportunity to prove up their claims through the already established channels of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. This is not only good business, but good sense.

If the United States were to wait for the eventual overturn of the Castro regime before proceeding to adjudication of claims, the expense could be much greater in proving up the claims, not only to the claimants, but to the United States as well. Witnesses must be located, that is, if they are still living, records must be gathered and the time-consuming process of adjudication must begin.

One businessman who testified during the hearings on this legislation is a good case in point. All of his records were taken or destroyed by the officials of the Castro government at the time of expropriation, and only one person remained, outside of his family, who could testify to his ownership of his own knowledge. That person recently died.

When the time comes, and the Castro government has toppled, as it will, we must be prepared to offer our American citizens the protection they deserve by having proved up in this formal adjudicatory procedure the amount of their claim.

The entire program as outlined in H.R. 12259 and H.R. 12260, introduced by my able colleague from Alabama, will be extremely helpful to our State Department in their negotiations with a new government in Cuba and will place us in a much stronger position for reaching a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there is another important matter to which I would like to call attention. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, when it unanimously reported this bill, stated as follows:

The committee respectfully directs the attention of the Department of State and the Agency for International Development to the opportunities for enhancing the Alliance for Progress through the use of the experience and skills acquired by some of these claimants in the course of their business operations in Cuba. Americans who were successful in foreign investments in Cuba should be encouraged to reinvest in other Latin American countries in acceptable projects under the Alliance for Progress. Private enterprise still plays the major role in carrying out the economic improvement of developing countries. Americans who are claimants have the ability and the know-how which can be useful in support of a major U.S. effort to bring about economic and social improvement in Latin America and to thwart Communist objectives.

The bill as reported by the committee contains no loan provisions as provided in H.R. 10327 and which had as a prerequisite the adjudication of claims. There now exist in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provisions for direct loans and for investment guarantees to U.S. private enterprise. The committee believes that no additional authority for loans is considered necessary in this legislation.

However, the committee suggests that the Secretary of State take into consideration the successful foreign investment experience of any qualified claimant under this legislation who may apply, under existing law, either for a loan or an investment guarantee.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to provide some 4,000 American citizens throughout the United States with the protection they deserve, we must enact H.R. 12259 which is in accordance with the principles of international law and equally important, in the interest of justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE V

"Purpose of title

"SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this title to provide for the determination of the amount and validity of claims against the Government of Cuba which have arisen since January 1, 1959, out of nationalization, expropriation, intervention, or other takings of, or special measures directed against, property of nationals of the United States, and claims for disability or death of nationals of the United States arising out of violations of international laws by the Government of Cuba, in order to obtain information concerning the total amount of such claims against the Government of Cuba on behalf of nationals of the United States.

"Definitions

"SEC. 502. For the purposes of this title:

"(1) The term 'national of the United States' means (A) a natural person who is a citizen of the United States, or (B) a corporation or other legal entity which is organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State, the District or Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, if natural persons who are citizens of the United States own, directly or indirectly, 50 per centum or more of the outstanding capital stock or other beneficial interest of such corporation or entity. The term does not include aliens.

"(2) The term 'Commission' means the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

"(3) The term 'property' means any property, right, or interest, including any leasehold interest, and debts owed by the Government of Cuba or by enterprises which have been nationalized, expropriated, intervened, or taken by the Government of Cuba and debts which are a charge on property which has been nationalized, expropriated, intervened, or taken by the Government of Cuba.

"(4) The term 'Government of Cuba' includes the government of any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

"Receipt of claims

"SEC. 503. (a) The Commission shall receive and determine in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the amount and validity of claims by nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba arising since January 1, 1959, for losses resulting from the nationalization, expropriation, intervention, or other taking of, or special measures directed against, property including any rights or interests therein owned wholly or partially, directly or indirectly at the time by nationals of the United States, if such claims are submitted to the Commission within such period specified by the Commission by notice published in the Federal Register (which period shall not be more than eighteeen months after such publication) within sixty days after the enactment of this title or of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title, whichever date is later. In making the determination with respect to the validity and amount of claims and value of properties, rights, or interests taken, the Commission shall take into account the basis of valuation most appropriate to the property and equitable to the claimant, including but not limited to, (i) fair market value, (ii) book value, (iii) going concern value, or (iv) cost of replacement.

"(b) The Commission shall receive and determine in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the amount and validity of claims by nationals of the United States against the Governmen of Cuba arising since January 1, 1959, for disability or death resulting from actions taken by or under the authority of the Government of Cuba, if such claims are submitted to the Commission within the period established by the Commission under subsection (a), or within six months after the date the claims first arose (as determined by the Commission), whichever date last occurs.

"Ownership of claims

"SEC. 504. (a) A claim shall not be considered under section 503(a) of this title unless the property on which the claim was based was owned wholly or partially, directly or indirectly by a national of the United States on the date of the loss and unless the claim has been held by one or more nationals of the United States continuously thereafter until the date of filing with the Commission.

"(b) A claim for disability shall not be considered under section 503(b) of this title unless filed by or on behalf of the disabled person. A claim for death under such section shall not be considered unless filed by or on behalf of the widow or widower, child or parents of the deceased person.

"Corporate claims

"SEC. 505. (a) A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon an ownership interest in any corporation, association, or other entity which is a national of the United States shall not be considered.

"(b) A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon a direct ownership interest in a corporation, association, or other entity for loss shall be considered, subject to the other provisions of this title, if such corporation, association, or other entity on the date of the loss was not a national of the United States, without regard to the per centum of ownership vested in the claimant.

"(c) A claim under section 503(a) of this title based upon an indirect ownership interest in a corporation, association, or other entity for loss shall be considered, subject to the other provisions of this title, only if at least 25 per centum of the entire ownership interest thereof at the time of such loss was vested in nationals of the United States.

"(d) The amount of any claim covered by subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall be calculated on the basis of the total loss suffered by such corporation, association, or other entity, and shall bear the same proportion to such loss as the ownership interest of the claimant at the time of loss bears to the entire ownership interest thereof.

"Offsets

"SEC. 506. In determining the amount of any claim, the Commission shall deduct all amounts the claimant has received from any source on account of the same loss or losses.

"Action of Commission with respect to claims

"SEC. 507. The Commission shall certify to each individual who has filed a claim under this title the amount determined by the Commission to be the loss or damage suffered by the claimant which is covered by this title. The Commission shall certify to the Secretary of State such amount and the basic information underlying that amount.

"Transfer of records

"SEC. 508. The Secretary of State shall transfer or otherwise make available to the Commission such records and documents relating to claims authorized by this as may be required by the Commission in carrying out its functions under this title.

"Application of other laws

"SEC. 509. To the extent they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, the following provisions of title I of this Act shall be applicable to this title: Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (h), and (j) of section 4; subsection (f) of section 7.

"Settlement period

"SEC. 510. The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to this title not later than three years following the final date for the filing of claims as provided in section 503(a) of this title or following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title, whichever date is later.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $750,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to pay its administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title.

"Separability

"SEC. 512. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks following the passage of the bill S. 927, and my remarks on the bill S. 2701.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 11296, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1965, have until midnight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1781)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent exectuive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 24, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 191, 210, and 214.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 17, 22, 195, 196, 203, 205, 206, 211, and 216, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", and not to exceed $14,500,000 shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters except in construction of new buildings under the heading, "Construction, Public Buildings Projects", for the fiscal year 1965."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,607,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,358,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$82,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,996,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$273,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "fourteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$542,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,565,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,710,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,439,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$219,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation may be used after January 1, 1965, to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "fallout shelters (in new buildings only) and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$153,167,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,204,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,383,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$810,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,981,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,614,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,050,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,487,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$954,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,804,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,120,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,956,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,230,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,145,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,176,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,502,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,108,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,670,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,055,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,937,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,517,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,784,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 201: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "thirty-seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 202: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 202, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,485,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$4,363,594,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Insert the matter proposed by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

"Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation 'Administrative Operations' in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase, maintenance and operation of one aircraft; hire of one aircraft;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 212: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,009,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 213: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$155,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 218: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$98,103,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", but not to exceed $380,000,000,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,747,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,687,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 223: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 223, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$78,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 28, 186, 187, 188, 208, and 220.

ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE L. EVINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Executive Office of the President

Office of Emergency Planning

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,600,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $4,285,000 as proposed by the House and $4,855,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Authorizes $400,000 for research and studies instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Inserts language proposed by the Senate authorizing use of research and study funds for emergency preparedness.

Office of Science and Technology

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $900,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $880,000 as proposed by the House and $950,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense

Civil Defense

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $75,000,000 for operation and maintenance instead of $70,000,000 as proposed by the House and $85,000,000 as passed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes $16,000,000 for matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate amended to limit management expenses to $14,500,000 instead of $13,500,000 as proposed by the House and restores House limitation of not to exceed 1,000 positions.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes House language and inserts Senate language as proposed by the Senate concerning marking and stocking of fallout shelters.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $30,200,000 for research, shelter survey, marking and stocking instead of $19,200,000 as proposed by the House and $69,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate prohibiting use of any funds for fallout shelter construction, amended to except new buildings under the General Services Administration for the fiscal year 1965 only.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $8,875,000 for emergency health activities of the Public Health Service instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the House and $9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Independent offices

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $10,607,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $10,440,000 as proposed by the House and $10,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14: Appropriate $82,500,000 for payments to air carriers instead of $79,000,000 as proposed by the House and $86,124,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have been wrestling many years with continuing subsidies for helicopter service for three cities while 39 other cities need it as badly as those that now have it. This is the last money to be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively. The conferees respectfully request the CAB not to include one penny for these three lines in its budget next year. This position is unanimously agreed to by the House conferees and a majority of the conferees of the Senate.

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $21,996,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $21,805,000 as proposed by the House and $22,187,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Authorizes $273,500 for administrative expenses of the employees life insurance fund instead of $270,000 as proposed by the House and $277,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Aviation Agency

Amendment No. 17: Deletes language proposed by the House relating to flight service stations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Authorize purchase of 14 passenger motor vehicles of which 10 are for replacement only instead of purchase of 12 vehicles of which 8 are for replacement as proposed by the House and purchase of 16 vehicles of which 12 are for replacement as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $542,600,000 for operation instead of $537,600,000 as proposed by the House and $544,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22: Authorize $6,200,000 for the total cost of aviation medicine instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,344,000 as proposed by the Senate; and limits the number of positions to 406 as proposed by the Senate instead of 396 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $50,000,000 for facilities and equipment as proposed

by the House instead of $66,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes language proposed by the Senate concerning reimbursement for the cost of road improvements.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $40,000,000 for research and development instead of $21,000,000 as proposed by the House and $42,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees recommend that the number of jobs at the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center be reduced and that a larger part of the research be done by private contract. The budget proposes spending over $30,000,000 at the facility, of which $17,500,000 is charged to research, and includes costly modernization, which is certainly excessive. In its next budget presentation to the committees, the FAA is respectfully requested to include everything relating to this facility as a separate item so as to give a complete picture of the cost and work performed at this center.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $3,565,000 for operation and maintenance of Washington National Airport instead of $3,530,000 as proposed by the House and $3,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $1,710,000 for construction at Washington National Airport instead of $1,620,000 as proposed by the House and $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $16,385,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $16,310,000 as proposed by the House and $16,460,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Commission has not been living up to many directives in recent years earmarking additional funds for processing applications for licenses in the Bureau of Safety and Special Radio Services. The present backlog is disgraceful and the Commission is directed not to divert any of the employees presently engaged in processing such applications, and to get the work current without further delay.

Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $12,439,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $12,180,000 as proposed by the House and $12,699,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $12,875,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $12,725,000 as proposed by the House and $13,025,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $219,185,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of $213,800,000 as proposed by the House and $224,570,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate amended to prohibit financing, beginning January 1, 1965, of new or expanded space costs which have not previously been funded by transfer to GSA to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year.

Amendment No. 34: Inserts language proposed by the Senate amended to permit use of funds to provide fallout shelters in new buildings only.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $153,167,000 for construction of public buildings projects instead of $151,722,000 as proposed by the House and $161,247,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Provides $144,800 for Federal office building, Centre, Ala., as proposed by the House instead of $152,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Provides $417,200 for post office and Federal office building, Cullman, Ala., as proposed by the House instead of $440,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Provides $169,900 for post office and Federal office building, Vernon, Ala., as proposed by the House instead of $179,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Provides $311,700 for post office and Federal office building, Hope, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $329,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Provides $178,100 for post office and Federal office building, Marshall, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $188,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Provides $91,800 for post office and Federal office building, McCrory, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $96,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Provides $179,800 for post office and Federal office building, Mountain Home, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of $189,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Provides $306,300 for post office and Federal office building, Blythe, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $323,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Provides $146,000 for post office and Federal office building, Del Mar, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $154,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Provides $152,500 for post office and Federal office building, Harbor City, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $160,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Provides $255,600 for post office and Federal office building, Jackson, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $269,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Provides $2,572,200 for Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $2,715,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Provides $146,000 for post office and Federal office building, Solana Beach, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $154,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Provides $126,700 for post office and Federal office building, Weed, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $133,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Provides $13,204,300 for Federal office building, West Los Angeles, Calif., instead of $13,101,300 as proposed by the House and $13,932,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Provides $312,100 for post office and Federal office building, Glenwood Springs, Colo., as proposed by the House instead of $329,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Provides $176,400 for post office and Federal office building, Leadville, Colo., as proposed by the House instead of $186,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Provides $240,700 for post office and Federal office building, Windsor Locks, Conn., as proposed by the House instead of $254,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Provides $141,700 for post office and Federal office building, Cross City, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $149,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Provides $152,800 for post office and Federal office building, Oakland Park Branch, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $161,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides $6,383,300 for Federal office building, Jacksonville, Fla., instead of $6,266,300 as proposed by the House and $6,731,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Provides $204,400 for post office and Federal office building, Gratigny Branch, Miami, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $215,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Provides $124,300 for post office and Federal office building, Ocoee, Fla., as proposed by the House instead of $131,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Provides $127,000 for post office and Federal office building, Acworth, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $134,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides $208,400 for post office and Federal office building, Chatsworth, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $219,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Provides $282,600 for post office and Federal office building, Toccoa, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $298,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Provides $70,200 for post office and Federal office building, Warm Springs, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of $74,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63: Provides $110,600 for post office and Federal office building, Arthur, Ill., as proposed by the House instead of $116,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Provides $810,700 for Federal office building, East St. Louis, Ill., instead of $773,700 as proposed by the House and $853,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 65: Provides $342,900 for post office and Federal office building, Edwardsville, Ill., as proposed by the House instead of $361,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Provides $94,600 for post office and Federal office building, Red Bud, Ill., as proposed by the House instead of $99,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Provides $1,981,800 for courthouse and Federal office building, Evansville, Ind., instead of $1,900,800 as proposed by the House and $2,087,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 68: Provides $1,614,600 for post office and Federal office building, Evansville, Ind., instead of $1,542,600 as proposed by the House and $1,700,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69: Provides $232,900 for post office and Federal office building, Scottsburg, Ind., as proposed by the House instead of $245,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Provides $119,700 for post office and Federal office building, Shoals, Ind., as proposed by the House instead of $126,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71: Provides $8,050,700 for Federal office building, Des Moines, Iowa, instead of $7,931,700 as proposed by the House and $8,491,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72: Provides $281,000 for post office and Federal office building, Scott City, Kans., as proposed by the House instead of $296,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Provides $259,200 for post office and Federal office building, Wellington, Kans., as proposed by the House instead of $273,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Provides $185,300 for post office and Federal office building, Clinton, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $195,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75: Provides $3,438,000 for Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Covington, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $3,629,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Provides $102,200 for post office and Federal office building, Cumberland, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $107,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Provides $148,400 for post office and Federal office building, Olive Hill, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $156,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Provides $218,100 for post office and Federal office building, Paris, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $230,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Provides $160,800 for Federal office building, Richmond, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $169,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80: Provides $86,100 for post office and Federal office building, Russell

Springs, Ky., as proposed by the House instead of $90,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81: Provides $3,487,000 for post office and Federal office building, Baton Rouge, La., instead of $3,393,000 as proposed by the House and $3,675,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82: Provides $303,500 for post office and Federal office building, Crowley, La., as proposed by the House instead of $320,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Provides $101,600 for post office and Federal office building, Gueydan, La., as proposed by the House instead of $106,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Provides $72,000 for post office and Federal office building, Mamou, La., as proposed by the House instead of $76,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 85: Provides $80,300 for post office and Federal office building, Mansura, La., as proposed by the House instead of $84,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86: Provides $97,400 for post office and Federal office building, Oberlin, La., as proposed by the House instead of $102,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87: Provides $954,600 for post office and courthouse, Opelousas, La., instead of $903,600 as proposed by the House and $1,004,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 88: Provides $263,500 for post office and Federal office building, Thibodaux, La., as proposed by the House instead of $278,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 89: Provides $278,200 for post office and Federal office building, Calais, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of $293,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90: Provides $104,500 for post office and Federal office building, Lubec, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of $110,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 91: Provides $220,600 for post office and Federal office building, Machias, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of $232,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 92: Provides $205,000 for post office and Federal office building, Centreville, Md., as proposed by the House instead of $217,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 93: Provides $114,800 for post office and Federal office building, North East, Md., as proposed by the House and $121,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94: Provides $185,900 for post office and Federal office building, Prince Frederick, Md., as proposed by the House instead of $196,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 95: Provides $3,213,000 for central heating plant, Suitland, Md., as proposed by the House instead of $3,341,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96: Provides $883,800 for Federal records center, General Services Administration, Boston, Mass., as proposed by the House instead of $932,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendemnt No. 97: Provides $3,748,500 for Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Boston-Lawrence area, Massachusetts, as proposed by the House instead of $3,956,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 98: Provides $242,800 for post office and Federal office building, Marlboro, Mass., as proposed by the House instead of $256,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99: Provides $274,600 for post office and Federal office building, Milford, Mass., as proposed by the House instead of $289,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100: Provides $2,804,500 for post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Mass., instead of $2,704,500 as proposed by the House and $2,954,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101: Provides $2,925,000 for Internal Revenue Service National Administrative Center and Regional Training Center Building, Detroit, Mich., as proposed by the House instead of $3,087,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 102: Provides $89,000 for post office and Federal office building. Lawton Mich., as proposed by the House instead of $93,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Provides $94,100 for post office and Federal office building, Mancelona, Mich., as proposed by the House instead of $99,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 104: Provides $159,700 for post office and Federal office building, Baudette, Minn., as proposed by the House instead of $168,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 105: Provides $9,120,300 for courthouse and Federal office building, St. Paul, Minn., instead of $8,993,300 as proposed by the House and $9,620,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 106: Provides $154,800 for post office and Federal office building, Bay Springs, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $163,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 107: Provides $83,500 for post office and Federal office building, Coldwater, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $88,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 108: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, Port Gibson, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 109: Provides $80,700 for post office and Federal office building, Richton, Miss., as proposed by the House instead of $85,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 110: Provides $142,200 for post office and Federal office building, Branson, Mo., as proposed by the House instead of $150,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111: Provides $125,900 for post office and Federal office building, Crystal City, Mo., as proposed by the House instead of $132,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 112: Provides $248,000 for post office and Federal office building, Montgomery City, Mo., as proposed by the House instead of $261,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 113: Provides $178,700 for post office and Federal office building, Fullerton, Nebr., as proposed by the House instead of $188,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 114: Provides $147,800 for post office and Federal office building, Gothenburg, Nebr., as proposed by the House instead of $156,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 115: Provides $1,956,100 for post office and courthouse, Carson City, Nev., instead of $1,889,100 as proposed by the House and $2,061,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 116: Provides $317,000 for post office and Federal office building, Berlin, N.H., as proposed by the House instead of $334,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 117: Provides $133,200 for post office and Federal office building, Avenel, N.J., as proposed by the House instead of $140,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 118: Provides $261,800 for post office and Federal office building, Burlington, N.J., as proposed by the House instead of $276,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 119: Provides $12,230,200 for Federal office building, Newark, N.J., instead of $12,121,200 as proposed by the House and $12,903,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120: Provides $319,000 for post office and Federal office building, Raton, N. Mex., as proposed by the House instead of $336,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 121: Provides $11,145,900 for Federal office building, Buffalo, N.Y., instead of $11,034,900 as proposed by the House and $11,758,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 122: Provides $106,100 for post office and Federal office building, Keeseville, N.Y., as proposed by the House instead of $112,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 123: Provides $105,100 for post office and Federal office building, Andrews, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $110,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 124: Provides $111,600 for post office and Federal office building, Cary, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $117,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 125: Provides $274,700 for post office and Federal office building, Jacksonville, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $289,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 126: Provides $164,300 for Federal office building, Kinston, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $173,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 127: Provides $101,700 for post office and Federal office building, Mars Hill, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $107,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 128: Provides $226,900 for post office and Federal office building, Raeford, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $239,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 129: Provides $87,300 for post office and Federal office building, Rich Square, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $92,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 130: Provides $401,000 for post office and Federal office building, Waynesville, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $423,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 131: Provides $151,100 for post office and Federal office building, Windsor, N.C., as proposed by the House instead of $159,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 132: Provides $337,300 for post office and Federal office building, Hillsboro, Ohio, as proposed by the House instead of $356,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 133: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, Mantua, Ohio, as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 134: Provides $107,300 for post office and Federal office building, Afton, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $113,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 135: Provides $222,400 for post office and Federal office building, Elk City, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $234,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 136: Provides $269,500 for post office and Federal office building, Hugo, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $284,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 137: Provides $174,800 for post office and Federal office building, Jay, Okla., as proposed by the House instead of $184,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 138: Provides $1,176,800 for post office and Federal office building, Baker, Oreg., instead of $1,117,800 as proposed by the House and $1,238,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 139: Provides $195,900 for post office and Federal office building, Enterprise, Oreg., as proposed by the House instead of $206,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 140: Provides $252,300 for post office and Federal office building, Prineville, Oreg., as proposed by the House instead of $266,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 141: Provides $125,700 for post office and Federal office building, Scappoose, Oreg., as proposed by the House instead of $132,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 142: Provides $267,800 for post office and Federal office building, Berwick, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $282,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 143: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, Brookville, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 144: Provides $151,700 for post office and Federal office building, Dallas, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $160,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 145: Provides $92,300 for post office and Federal office building, Dun-

cannon, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $97,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 146: Provides $96,700 for post office and Federal office building, Falls Creek, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $102,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 147: Provides $119,500 for post office and Federal office building, Galeton, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $126,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 148: Provides $151,700 for post office and Federal office building, Hawley, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $160,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 149: Provides $224,400 for post office and Federal office building, Irwin, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $236,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 150: Provides $151,700 for post office and Federal office building, Montrose, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $160,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 151: Provides $154,400 for post office and Federal office building, New Bethlehem, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $163,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 152: Provides $182,300 for post office and Federal office building, Cedarhurst Branch, Pittsburgh, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $192,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 153: Provides $182,300 for post office and Federal office building, Green Tree Branch, Pittsburgh, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $192,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 154: Provides $182,300 for post office and Federal office building, Pleasant Hills Branch, Pittsburgh, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $192,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 155: Provides $96,700 for post office and Federal office building, Youngsville, Pa., as proposed by the House instead of $107,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 156: Provides $181,300 for post office and Federal office building, Humacao, P.R., as proposed by the House instead of $191,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 157: Provides $235,300 for post office and Federal office building, Olneyville Station, Providence, R.I., as proposed by the House instead of $248,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 158: Provides $87,400 for post office and Federal office building, Elloree, S.C., as proposed by the House instead of $92,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 159: Provides $246,500 for post office and Federal office building, Ridgeland, S.C., as proposed by the House instead of $260,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 160: Provides $91,800 for post office and Federal office building, Williston, S.C., as proposed by the House instead of $96,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 161: Provides $131,800 for post office and Federal office building, Oneida, Tenn., as proposed by the House instead of $139,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 162: Provides $86,000 for post office and Federal office building, Buffalo, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $90,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 163: Provides $235,600 for post office and Federal office building, Carthage, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $248,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 164: Provides $168,700 for post office and Federal office building, Fairfield, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $178,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 165: Provides $224,000 for post office and Federal office building, Gonzales, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $236,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 166: Provides $104,100 for post office and Federal office building, Naples, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $109,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 167: Provides $279,500 for post office and Federal office building, Sulphur Springs, Tex., as proposed by the House instead of $295,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 168: Provides $161,300 for post office and Federal office building, Heber, Utah, as proposed by the House instead of $170,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 169: Provides $378,000 for post office and Federal office building, Provo, Utah, as proposed by the House instead of $399,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 170: Provides $335,000 for post office and Federal office building, St. Johnsbury, Vt., as proposed by the House instead of $353,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 171: Provides $120,200 for post office and Federal office building, Cle Elum, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $126,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 172: Provides $393,200 for Federal office building, Colville, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $415,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 173: Provides $136,700 for post office and Federal office building, Newport, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $144,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 174: Provides $6,502,500 for courthouse and Federal office building, Spokane, Wash., instead of $6,385,500 as proposed by the House and $6,857,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 175: Provides $426,500 for Federal office building, Vancouver, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of $450,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 176: Provides $115,200 for post office and Federal office building, Gassaway, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $121,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 177: Provides $159,300 for post office and Federal office building, Glenville, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $168,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 178: Provides $171,200 for post office and Federal office building, Parsons, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $180,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 179: Provides $157,500 for post office and Federal office building, Pineville, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $166,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 180: Provides $232,200 for post office and Federal office building, Summerville, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $245,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 181: Provides $129,300 for post office and Federal office building, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., as proposed by the House instead of $136,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 182: Provides $152,700 for post office and Federal office building, Eagle River, Wis., as proposed by the House instead of $161,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 183: Provides $113,400 for post office and Federal office building, Elroy, Wis., as proposed by the House instead of $119,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 184: Provides $120,800 for post office and Federal office building, Horicon, Wis., as proposed by the House instead of $127,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 185: Provides $26,108,100 for Housing and Home Finance Agency building, District of Columbia, instead of $26,027,100 as proposed by the House and $27,554,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 186 and 187: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 188: Reported in disagreement. The conferees are agreed that they will recommend $20,109,000 for sites and expenses of 37 authorized public buildings projects instead of $33,200,000 for 43 projects as proposed by the Senate. Two projects have been deleted because they have not been authorized and if authorized funds will be forthcoming next year. Four other projects proposed for the District of Columbia have been deleted but will receive early consideration in the bill when submitted next year.

Amendment No. 189: Appropriates $50,670,000 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service instead of $48,920,000 as proposed by the House and $52,420,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 190: Appropriates $15,055,000 for operating expenses of the National Archives and Records Service instead of $14,955,000 as proposed by the House and $15,155,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 191: Appropriates $5,465,000 for operating expenses of the Transportation and Communications Service as proposed by the House instead of $5,765,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 192: Authorizes $2,937,500 for operating expenses, strategic and critical materials, instead of $2,875,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 193: Appropriates $1,517,500 for salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator, instead of $1,505,000 as proposed by the House and $1,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 194: Limits amount which may be deposited into the administrative operations fund to $20,000,000 instead of $19,565,000 as proposed by the House and $21,840,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 195: Appropriates $100,000 to the working capital fund as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 196: Inserts language authorizing purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed $4,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 197: Appropriates $15,725,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator, instead of $15,525,000 as proposed by the House and $15,925,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 198: Authorizes $3,375,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator instead of $3,250,000 as proposed by the House and $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 199: Appropriates $25,000 for administrative expenses, low income housing demonstrations, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 200: Appropriates $15,784,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration instead of $15,484,000 as proposed by the House and $16,084,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 201: Authorizes purchase of 37 passenger motor vehicles instead of 36 as proposed by the House and 38 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 202: Appropriates $25,485,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $25,260,000 as proposed by the House and $25,710,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 203: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204: Appropriates $4,363,594,000 for research and development instead of $4,413,594,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 205: Appropriates $262,880,500 for construction of facilities as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 206: Appropriates $623,525,500 for administrative operations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 207: Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to transfer of funds and funds available to the Administrator amended to delete emergency expense.

Amendment No. 208: Reported in disagreement.

National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 209 and 210: Insert language proposed by the Senate amended to authorize purchase, maintenance, and operation of one aircraft, and hire of one aircraft, and delete language proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendment No. 211: Inserts language proposed by the Senate authorizing hire of motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 212: Appropriates $40,009,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $39,440,000 as proposed by the House and $40,578,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 213: Appropriates $155,125,000 for general operating expenses instead of $155,000,000 as proposed by the House and $155,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 214: Appropriates $14,200,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses as proposed by the House instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 215 and 216: Appropriate $37,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House and $38,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $1,275,000 for prosthetic research as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,170,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 217: Appropriates $37,100,000 for readjustment benefits instead of $34,600,000 as proposed by the House and $39,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 218: Appropriates $98,103,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities instead of $91,233,000 as proposed by the House and $98,733,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $6,870,000 over the House includes funds to convert 2,000 beds for nursing home-type patients within the overall 125,000-bed limitation. No funds are included for fallout shelters.

Amendment No. 219: Restores House limitation on funds for property acquisition and other loan guarantee and insurance operations and authorizes $380,000,000 instead of $257,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 220: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendment No. 221: Authorizes $3,747,500 for administrative expenses instead of $3,670,000 as proposed by the House and $3,825,000 as proposed by the Senate. No part of the funds allowed are for printing costs in excess of the amount used in fiscal year 1964.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 222: Authorizes $9,687,500 for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $10,375,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 223: Authorizes $78,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $78,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE L. EVINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PROTECTING HEADS OF FOREIGN STATES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1917) to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other officials.

May I say that this bill provides authority to protect heads of foreign states, comparable let us say to the President of the United States, traveling abroad, or foreign ministers, comparable, may I say, to our Secretary of State traveling abroad. This is brought about by the assassination of President Kennedy. The House passed an identical bill, H.R. 7651, on May 4, and the Senate passed an identical bill. The purpose here is to approve the Senate bill.

The purpose of the bill is to provide the Department of State with additional authority necessary to enable it to discharge its responsibilities in safeguarding certain distinguished foreign officials who visit in the United States under the auspices of the Government of the United States.

The bill does three things:

First. It amends section 11, title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal offense to assault the head of a foreign state or of a foreign government or a foreign minister. At present this section protects ambassadors and other public ministers.

Second. It amends section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal offense to kill security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of official duties. This would automatically make it a Federal offense to assault such personnel—section 111, title 18, United States Code—and

Third. It authorizes security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service—who are already authorized to carry firearms to protect certain national and foreign dignitaries—title 5, United States Code, section 170e—to arrest without a warrant persons violating title 18, United States Code, section 111 or 112 in their presence, or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such offense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 112 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel

"Whoever assaults, strikes, wounds, imprisons, or offers violence to the person of a head of foreign state or foreign government, foreign minister, ambassador or other public minister, in violation of the law of nations, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"Whoever, in the commission of any such acts, uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis in chapter 7, title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting.

"112. Assaulting public minister"

and inserting in lieu thereof

"112. Assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel".

SEC. 3. Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before "while engaged in the performance of his official duties," the following: "or any security officer of the Department of State or the Foreign Service,".

SEC. 4. The Act of June 28, 1955 (ch. 199, 69 Stat. 188; 5 U.S.C. 170e) is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof, to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service engaged in the performance of the duties prescribed in section 1 of this Act are empowered to arrest without warrant and deliver into custody any person violating section 111 or 112 of title 18, United States Code, in their presence or if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such a violation."

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall create immunity from criminal prosecution under any laws in any State, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OTHER COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11466) to enact subtitle II, "Other Commercial Transactions," of title 28, "Commercial Instruments and Transactions," of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, line 28, after "wages," insert "upon conviction".

Page 17, line 15, strike out "of" the first time it appears and insert "or".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the amendments are germane to this bill?

Mr. WILLIS. They are germane; they are grammatical changes and technical changes.

Mr. GROSS. This is a bill that the House previously passed?

Mr. WILLIS. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING AREA OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 818 and ask for its immediate consideration.

 August 13, 1964

18. CONTAINERS. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9334, to amend the Standard Container Act of 1928 relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, so as to permit the use of additional standard containers (S. Rept. 1429). p. 18776

19. LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration this bill, H. R. 10809. p. D68

20. RECLAMATION. The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration the following bills: S. J. Res. 6, to cancel unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River irrigation project, Wyo., charged against certain non-Indian lands (amended); S. 770, providing for construction and operation of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colo. and Wyo. (amended); S. 3053, to increase authorizations for construction of the Riverton Federal reclamation project; and H. R. 130, providing for payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the U. S. in connection with reclamation projects begun after January 1, 1961. p. D689

21. AUDIT. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 4223, to provide for the audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law. pp. D690-1

HOUSE

22. RECREATION. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 3846, to establish a land and water conservation fund. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 18671

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6925, to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park, Utah. p. D692

23. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11296, and acted on items in disagreement. Prior to this action rejected, 114 to 270, a motion by Rep. Wyman to recommit the bill to conference. pp. 18672-81

24. HOUSING; LOANS. Passed with amendments S. 3049, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. House conferees were appointed. H. R. 12175, a similar bill previously passed, 308 to 68, with amendments, was tabled. Generally, the bill would provide additional authorizations and funds to continue existing federally assisted housing programs for another year. Title V would authorize an $150 million additional for direct loans under the rural housing program administered by the Farmers Home Administration. pp. 18682-733

25. RESEARCH. Received the conference report on H. R. 4364, to provide for duty-free entry of mass spectrometers for Oregon State and Wayne State universities (H. Rept. 1802). pp. 18770, 18772

26. EDUCATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 11904, to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (p.18772) Rep. Pucinski stated his intention to offer a series of amendments to remove from this bill sections which would prohibit institutions of higher learning from participating in more than one Federal loan program (p. 18735).

27. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11579 (H. Rept. 1794). pp. 18762-70

28. COFFEE. Received the conference report on H. R. 8864, to implement the International Coffee Agreement (H. Rept. 1803). pp. 18770-1

29. MEAT IMPORTS. Rep. Battin spoke in favor of meat-import restrictions and asked that the "administration be willing to protect American cattlemen." pp. 18740-1
Rep. Harvey inserted an article, "Meat Import Mischief," and stated that it "is so misleading and unfair to the beef industry that its contents should not go unchallenged." pp. 18742-3

30. FOREIGN AID. Rep. McIntire protested the "squandering of taxpayers' money" for the foreign-aid program. pp. 18743-4

31. TRADE EXPANSION. Rep. Moore inserted a statement on import-export policy and urged passage of legislation which would prevent further tariff reductions in all instances in which imports have, in the past 5 years, demonstrated their competitive advantage in the domestic market. pp. 18744-6

32. LABOR STANDARDS. Rep. Cleveland discussed and outlined pending wage-and-hour legislation. pp. 18746-8

33. CLAIMS. Received from USDA a report of all claims adjudicated and paid by the Department for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act. p. 18771

34. GUAM. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3869, to establish Federal agricultural services for Guam. p. 18772

35. ELECTRIFICATION. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a report on S. 1007, to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. p. D693

36. PUBLIC LAW 480. Rep. Findley discussed the extension of Public Law 480 and urged "careful scrutiny...to the effect of Public Law 480 on our farm commodity programs." pp. 18748-9

37. SCIENCE; TECHNOLOGY. Rep. Daddario discussed a study made by the staff of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, to assess the ways in which existing sources already available can be made more effective. p. 18753

38. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that on Fri. H. R. 11904, to amend the National Education Act, and H. R. 3869, to furnish technical agricultural assistance to Guam, will probably be considered. p. 18734

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

39. BUDGET; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Evins commended and inserted a report on an interview with Rep. Mahon "which sets forth his philosophy and provides valuable insights into the complex problems of Federal financing." pp. A4284-6

40. FARM SAFETY. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hartke urging increased efforts to promote farm safety. pp. A4286-7

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 1964 No. 158

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 1: 7: *For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art daily making us the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence, may our hearts now go out toward Thee with prayers of gratitude and pledges of love and devotion to the cause of righteousness and peace.

Inspire us with increasing tenacity of faith and obedience to Thy holy will and a loyalty and dedication that is determined to make a worthy contribution to the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

May we be more acutely sensitive and more eagerly responsive to Thy voice, calling us to give ourselves courageously to the task of safeguarding our heritage of freedom, which we greatly prize and are privileged to enjoy and share with others.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress may continue to manifest and maintain an unfailing trust in Thy divine sovereignty.

To Thy name may we ascribe all majesty, dominion, and power. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11083. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11241. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training professional nursing personnel, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3846. An act to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4649) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10199) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 10 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10723) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 34, 46, and 47 to the foregoing bill.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3846) to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, MORRIS, O'BRIEN of New York, SAYLOR, and KYL.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN B. BENNETT

(Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our departed colleague, and an intimate friend, John B. Bennett of Michigan.

John Bennett was a man dedicated to public service. He was a leader of the Michigan Republican delegation in the House, and a leader of my party.

He rose to be the ranking minority member of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and as such became an authority of the intricate legislation coming before that committee.

He also served on our House Administration Committee.

We will miss his faithful and dedicated service as will the State of Michigan.

I join with my colleagues in extending our condolences to his family and his friends.

ELECTION OF MICHAELIAN AS PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the House of the election in Washington yesterday of Edwin Michaelian as president of the National Association of County Officials for 1964–65. This 30th annual convention of the association was the largest gathering of county officials reportedly ever held in the United States—with some 2,800 delegates in attendance.

Mr. Michaelian, the county executive of Westchester County, is an outstanding American with broad experience in public service.

As president of the association—which includes representatives of 1,700 counties—Mr. Michaelian will, I am certain, be a forceful exponent for local government. He recognizes the importance of building local government and of not underestimating its capabilities to find creative and affirmative approaches to suburban living.

The platform plank of the convention on local government is—I believe—worth the attention and consideration of Members. Specifically, this plank states:

Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental agreements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 219 yesterday I was recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 221]

Alger	Harvey, Mich.	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashley	Healey	Olson, Minn.
Avery	Hébert	Passman
Baring	Hoffman	Powell
Barrett	Jones, Ala.	Ryan, Mich.
Blatnik	Kee	Scott
Bolton, Frances P.	Landrum	Senner
	Lankford	Sheppard
Buckley	Lesinski	Shipley
Burton, Utah	Lloyd	Sibal
Cameron	Mailliard	Smith, Va.
Casey	Mathias	Staebler
Cohelan	May	Thompson, La.
Dingell	Meader	Thompson, N.J.
Flynt	Miller, N.Y.	Toll
Gill	Morrison	Winstead
Hagan, Ga.	Nedzi	
Haley	Norblad	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 208, I am marked absent. I was present and answered to my name, and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 1480

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 349) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1480.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed two thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 1480, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, entitled "State Taxation of Interstate Commerce," with illustrations and maps, for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 12, 1964.)

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement. I shall attempt to explain the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations brings back this conference report. I shall repeat a few facts well known to all the Members.

This report covers some 24 or 25 agencies. When the bill was considered in the House, it carried about $13,454 million before the unauthorized space item was stricken on a point of order, so we will refer to the figure as being $13,319 million.

The bill went to the other body, and I believe I speak the sentiments of all the conferees on both sides of the aisle when I say that the other body did perhaps a magnificent job, one of the finest jobs we have ever seen it do. They changed the House figures only some $300 million, which is a relatively small amount. They did a fine job. Our relationships with the conferees of the other body are always pleasant, and were certainly pleasant this year.

In conference we reduced that $300 million to about $135 million.

There were 223 amendments in the Senate bill. That sounds like a lot of amendments and in truth and in fact it is a large number, but 150 are related to changes in limitations on construction projects.

We bring back to you in agreement everything in the conference report except six items in disagreement, and in truth and in fact there is not a single item in disagreement, since the six items were brought back because of technicalities. Everything was agreed to.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a summary table of the bill. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Summary tabulation, independent offices appropriation bill, 1965 (H.R. 11296)

Item	1965 budget estimate and 1964 supplementals	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$525,000	$500,000	$500,000	$500,000	−$25,000		
Office of Emergency Planning	13,700,000	9,975,000	10,545,000	10,290,000	−3,410,000	+$315,000	−$255,000
Disaster relief	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000			
Office of Science and Technology	950,000	880,000	950,000	900,000	−50,000	+20,000	−50,000
Civil Defense, Department of Defense	358,000,000	89,200,000	154,200,000	105,200,000	−252,800,000	+16,000,000	−49,000,000
Civil Defense, Department of Health Education, and Welfare	9,507,000	8,500,000	9,250,000	8,875,000	−632,000	+375,000	−375,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	93,599,000	89,440,000	96,899,000	93,107,500	−491,500	+3,667,500	−3,791,500
Civil Service Commission	115,025,000	114,505,000	114,887,000	114,696,000	−329,000	+191,000	−191,000
Federal Aviation Agency	831,850,000	775,249,000	818,999,000	799,374,000	−32,476,000	+24,125,000	−19,625,000
Federal Communications Commission	16,610,000	16,310,000	16,460,000	16,385,000	−225,000	+75,000	−75,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	(17,233,000)	(16,790,000)	(16,945,000)	(16,867,500)	(−365,500)	(+77,500)	(−77,500)
Federal Power Commission	13,335,000	12,180,000	12,699,000	12,439,500	−895,500	+259,500	−259,500
Federal Trade Commission	13,270,000	12,725,000	13,025,000	12,875,000	−395,000	+150,000	−150,000
General Services Administration	603,387,400	537,992,600	595,613,100	566,894,100	−36,493,300	+28,901,500	−28,719,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	434,690,000	262,362,400	262,812,400	262,587,400	−172,102,600	+225,000	−225,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	(8,800,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)	(−300,000)		
Federal Housing Administration	(90,125,000)	(84,000,000)	(89,125,000)	(87,687,500)	(−2,437,500)	(+3,687,500)	(−1,437,500)
Public Housing Administration	230,670,000	215,484,000	216,084,000	215,784,000	−14,886,000	+300,000	−300,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	25,850,000	25,260,000	25,710,000	25,485,000	−365,000	+225,000	−225,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,445,000,000	[1]	5,300,000,000	5,250,000,000	−195,000,000	+5,250,000,000	−50,000,000
National Capital Housing Authority	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000			
National Science Foundation	487,620,000	420,400,000	420,400,000	420,400,000	−67,220,000		
Renegotiation Board	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
Securities and Exchange Commission	15,325,000	14,680,000	14,680,000	14,680,000	−645,000		
Selective Service System	43,020,000	39,440,000	40,578,000	40,009,000	−3,011,000	+569,000	−569,000
Veterans' Administration	5,446,941,000	5,423,978,000	5,439,028,000	5,434,473,000	−12,468,000	+10,495,000	−4,555,000
Total, definite appropriations	14,221,511,400	[1] 8,091,698,000	13,585,956,000	13,427,591,500	−793,919,900	[1] +5,335,893,500	−158,365,000
Indefinite appropriations of receipts	28,142,000	27,267,500	27,267,500	17,267,500	−874,500		
Total	14,249,653,400	[1] 8,118,965,500	13,613,224,000	13,454,859,000	−794,794,400	[1] +5,335,893,500	−158,365,000

[1] NOTE.—Does not reflect $5,200,000,000 recommended by the House committee for the NASA, which was deleted from the bill in the House on a technicality. Comparative figures should reflect this adjustment.

That wraps it up. I would now like to yield to our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the comments made by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], with regard to the many perplexities and problems that are involved in this bill. As he indicated, your conferees, the managers on the part of the House, were faced with some 223 differences or amendments as between the Senate version and the House version of the bill. Of course, you will remember that when the bill was passed by the House, the appropriation of funds for NASA was eliminated by virtue of a point of order because the authorization had not yet become law. Aside from that, though, and the figures that are entailed, the point remains that the Senate increased the House figure by $294,258,000. Out of these 223 items or amendments in disagreement we finally resolved our differences after considerable struggle back and forth. We finally succeeded in reducing the Senate figure by $158,365,000. By the same token and on the other hand the House figure as it passed the House of Representatives originally was increased by about $135 million.

You might be interested to know that originally the House independent offices appropriation bill was $925 million below the budget estimate. As it comes to us today in the form of a conference report it remains $794,794,000 below the original budget estimate.

Now, there are many important programs and items in this bill, however we resolved our differences by splitting the figures as between the Senate and the House in many instances. The time allotted to me will not permit an explanation at this particular point in regard to all of these 223 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report, and I believe the House conferees have resolved these differences with reasonable and satisfactory results. Many large and important agencies of our Federal Government are involved in this appropriation bill, including the Veterans' Administration, the General Services Administration, NASA, FAA and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I believe this net reduction of nearly $800 million under the budget estimates to be sound and justifiable.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question about amendment No. 188 as contained on page 23 of the conference report of the independent offices appropriation bill. This amendment was reported in disagreement and in part it reads:

> Two projects have been deleted because they have not been authorized and, if authorized, funds will be forthcoming next year.

I should like at this time to ask the gentleman if the two projects to which reference is made here are the projects for a Federal building at Shreveport, La., and another building at Lincoln, Nebr.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the committee for their consideration and express my understanding of the problems involved under the rules which require an authorization.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Louisiana is always gracious and we appreciate his help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of the committee [Mr. WYMAN].

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House, a point of order was made against more than $5 billion in funds for NASA because the authorization had not at that time been approved. This meant that the appropriation of a sum in excess of $5,000 million has never been debated on this floor.

This is a staggering amount of money to be appropriated for any agency and more particularly when it is to be no year funds to remain available until expended. It is a sum in excess of the entire appropriation for the legislative branch of the Government, for the Interior Department and for many other departments combined. In fairness to the American taxpayer who must pay these bills and to all Americans whose real earnings are directly affected by variations in the purchasing power of their dollars, we should reduce a portion of these funds.

The combination of reduced revenues from taxation and several expensive nonfunded new programs sent to Congress by this administration without regard to vastly increased deficits and a substantial cumulative increase in the national debt makes it imperative to examine the justifications for the commitment of these vast sums to a single Government agency, romantic as may be the concept of a moonshot.

More than $4,363 million of this appropriation is requested for research and development in the NASA program and of this nearly $4 billion is for the project called Apollo, calling for a man on the moon by 1970.

As I have tried to point out in minority views as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee charged with the re-

sponsibility of screening these spending requests, there is no justification whatever for the establishment and continuation of a 1970 target date to land a man on the moon. Such a target date establishes a race to the moon with ourselves. It not only unnecessarily lends a crash element to procurements and spending in this field but creates the possibility of the impression of failure if we are late, for whatever reason.

It is indisputable that more money has been spent in this program derived from haste than was needed to have been spent had haste not been a factor. When sums as astronomical as those continually requested from Congress by this agency are involved, someone has to put on the brakes to protect against continual raids on the Public Treasury by overenthusiastic space advocates. It is up to us here in Congress to do this and in this direction I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to reduce the Apollo spacecraft procurement by $200 million.

I will admit in all candor that this is nowhere near the amount by which I would personally prefer to see this program cut back, for the time being, but I am also very much aware of the fact that the program has captured the popular imagination and that to achieve something for our people in the way of a sound economy is perhaps better than to have merely tried and achieved nothing. I want to assure every Member of this great House of Representatives that they can, without harm to this program and with a very direct and real saving to the taxpayers of the Nation, support this motion to recommit in this amount. Let me explain:

Almost a billion dollars in the appropriation is requested for the advance procurement of space capsules to be used in a manned lunar landing that is not even scheduled to take place for half a decade in the future. This is bad enough in the sense that it is far too long a lead-time in view of the rapid modern day expectable breakthroughs in the world of science. Yet it is worse when we realize that it is for capsules that are designed to rendezvous with each other from lunar orbit, when we have not yet even demonstrated a capability to rendezvous in space between manned spacecraft.

This development will be tested next year in the Gemini program. It is to be fervently hoped that the two-man flights of Gemini will work out successfully and that the follow-on flights in which astronauts will separate in space and then rejoin will also be successful. No part of the funds for this Gemini program are affected in any way by my motion to recommit.

However, with all due respect to the learned space enthusiasts, we are not sure and we cannot be sure that these things are capable of being done by man in space. We are not even sure—and we cannot be sure until there has been a human guinea pig—that a human being can survive protracted periods of weightlessness in space without serious and possibly fatal bodily harm. It will take a week at least to get to the moon and come back and this is a very important factor.

We should not be appropriating sorely needed marginal hundreds of millions of dollars for the advance procurement now of things that we may never even be able to use.

Thus, again with all due respect to my earnest colleagues on the authorizing committee, you cannot tell me or this House or the American people that the Gemini program is going to work. You cannot stand here on the floor of this House at this hour and give any assurance whatever to us that we will ever be able to use the lunar excursion module or command and service modules for which there is an advance appropriation in this bill of $710 million and I might add, cumulative prior appropriations of hundreds of millions more.

Furthermore, although the scientific achievement and technical precision of Ranger 7 is undeniable, as well as something of which the divisions of NASA responsible for this success can well be proud, the photographs transmitted to earth from Ranger 7 establish better than any argument I can make here now the total absence of life and unsuitability for life on the surface of the moon. Exactly what may be suggested as materially contributing to improved life on earth is to be found in attempting to land a human being in the vacuum that prevails on the lunar surface at a cost of billions of sorely needed earthly dollars is beyond me.

If it could be said with any cogency that we must do this before the Communists do or risk obliteration from a moon controlled earthly constructed military establishment, the situation would be different. But as of this hour, at this moment, there is no responsible evidence that the Communists are even engaged in an attempt themselves to put a man on the moon. Incidentally, this is not to say that they are not engaged in important space programs. Of course they are. But their space programs are militarily inspired with a military objective to establish control of space around the earth by communism. One does not have to be a graduate of the War College or a member of the National Security Council to know that such is the Communist objective in space, just as it is the Communist objective on earth.

All of which brings me back to the point I have sought to emphasize ever since becoming a member of this Appropriations Subcommittee, which is that our policy in our space programs is wrong and should be reevaluated; for what we should be developing in space is a manned and maneuverable capsule that can be launched into orbit, change its orbit, move laterally and vertically and return to earth when its pilot is directed or wishes to do so. Such capsules should have a weapons system. They should be able to inspect other objects in space and, if necessary, to destroy them.

Yet these are not the kind of capsules for which the billions in this bill are requested. It seems to me to be unnecessarily fraught with great risk to the national security as we proceed into this space age for our manned space flight programs at great costs to be directed toward a landing on the moon when our first priority both in regard to world opinion and the national security must be the continued American military capability to control space.

And so today I urge the Members of the House to support this small reduction in this appropriation directed to avoiding the commitment of some of the millions for the long-term procurement of spacecraft in the Apollo program. True, this will delay somewhat the construction of these spacecraft. But we should delay this construction until a successful Gemini shows we can use this kind of spacecraft for our lunar objective. I would like to emphasize at this point and as a part of my explanation of this motion to recommit, that if the Gemini program is successful and if it is established that astronauts can rendezvous, separate and rejoin in space, then I shall not thereafter seek to delay such procurement or otherwise to interfere with a rational and orderly advance toward whatever a majority of the Congress shall determine to be the then appropriate space policy of this Nation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the able and distinguished gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. CURTIS].

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and express my concern and regret that amendment No. 188 which will be reported in disagreement, which is for 37 authorized public building projects, in this instance includes money for St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, I had urged in testifying before the House subcommittee that this money be deleted and that the General Services Administration be required to answer why they had changed basic plans which were clearly economical to adopt new plans which looked, without further explanation, not to be in accord with good economy and good procedure.

Mr. Speaker, the House in its wisdom did not put this item in the appropriation bill. But when it went to the other body I find that the other body placed this money in the bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I might state that there is a group of people in St. Louis, very important people, including I might say our distinguished newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who are opposing this for different reasons than my own. Their reason for opposing it is in the field of esthetics. I do not profess to know much about that. There is their desire to preserve the historical building presently on this site.

Mr. Speaker, I do think that they are entitled to be heard and I regret the action on the part of the other body in going ahead in what I regard as a very callous way so that those in St. Louis who would like to be heard on this other aspect cannot be heard and the point of view they wish to express evaluated.

I again emphasize on top of this is the inability or failure of the GSA to justify this from an economic standpoint, which is the point I raise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include at this point the pertinent correspondence I have had with the GSA, which I think will point out to anyone the highhanded manner in which this agency is moving forward to force onto the community of St. Louis an item which they do not care to receive in this fashion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the correspondence above referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1963.

Mr. R. T. DALY,
Commissioner, Public Buildings Service,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DALY: During the past 5 months we have carried on a lengthy correspondence regarding the Old Customhouse at Eighth and Olive in St. Louis. Even as late as last summer the GSA indicated to Mr. Arthur E. Wright, Jr., formerly executive director of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., that they hoped to sell the Eighth and Olive site. Last fall a complete reversal in this policy was made, and, as you later reasoned to me in your letter of February 1, 1963:

"The General Services Administration's plans for the old customhouse and post office building and the site at Eighth and Olive Streets, St. Louis, Mo., about which you wrote us January 9, contemplate retention of the property for continued postal use and as the site for a future Federal building, construction of which will be proposed at the first reasonable opportunity under provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959."

In my letter of February 5, in response to this I said:

"This decision is a reversal of the previous decision to sell this very valuable site and repurchase a less costly site which was more suitable to the Government's needs. Under this decision the Federal Government would have gained several millions of dollars, the difference between the cost of the two sites; and the city of St. Louis would have regained in its tax base probably the most valuable site in the city.

"In light of this change of decision would you inform me what new factors went into the decision? Surely the Federal Government does not need the location at Eighth and Olive for reasons of efficiency of providing Federal office space: Indeed, other locations would seem to be much more efficient and suitable for the Government's purpose."

You responded to this on March 15 stating the following conclusion:

"We believe that the most practical means to serve patrons in the downtown retail business district is to utilize the customhouse property as a site for a future Federal building to house the Central Postal Station and other Federal activities."

You gave as reasons for this conclusion the following:

"The principal factor which influenced our decision to retain the property as a site for a future Federal building was the Post Office Department's continuing need for a postal station in the immediate Eighth and Olive Streets area."

You added that the Department had been "unsuccessful in its several attempts to acquire suitable quarters to permit the relocation of its Central Postal Station now housed in the old customhouse." You said that "alternative schemes for satisfying this postal requirement have also been explored but found infeasible by reason of the excessive costs involved." Finally you said that "* * * expansion of Federal activities in St. Louis has increased our requirements to the extent that we contemplate the construction of another public building as a part of our long-range plans for the city."

In a letter of April 5, 1963, I asked you to go into more detail on each of these points. In your reply of May 28 after noting that there was need for 230,000 more square feet of general office space and 14,000 square feet for an area post office, you said:

"A major consideration which influences our decision to retain the Eighth and Olive Streets property as a site for a future Federal building is the Post Office Department's continuing need for a postal station to serve the immediate area. Over an extended period the Department has been unsuccessful in its attempts to acquire suitable leased quarters to permit the relocation of the Central Postal Station now housed in the old customhouse."

To this I replied on June 10 and continue to reply, by referring to the basic question I asked in my letter of February 5:

"In light of this change in decision would you inform me what new factors went into this decision? Under the previous decision which you have overruled I pointed out the Federal Government would have gained several milions of dollars, the difference between the cost of the two sites (note the previous decision contemplated the erection of a new Federal building also, but on a less costly location) and the city of St. Louis would have regained in its tax base probably the most valuable site in the city."

Your reply of July 18 led me to believe that my suggestions had finally had some effect. Although you reiterated your belief that the postal requirements of downtown St. Louis necessitated a new building on the Eighth and Olive locations you agreed that "normally a site closer to other Federal buildings in St. Louis would be more suitable," and said:

"Before a recommendation for construction of an additional public building is submitted to the Committees on Public Works under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, an intensive economic analysis will be made of alternate locations which would provide adequate postal service to the area as well as provide a suitable location for other Federal agencies."

However, a mere 18 days later, in a letter to Senator SYMINGTON, Deputy Administrator Lawson Knott anounced that "the early approval be sought from the Public Works Committees of the Congress for a new Federal building in St. Louis, to be constructed on the site of the old customhouse at Eighth and Olive Streets." The reasons for the decision showed none of the benefit of the "intensive economic analysis" you promised. Indeed, the reasons given were the same that had been reiterated several times in our correspondence. You said:

"The foregoing decision has been reached after careful consideration of the Federal space situation in St. Louis. The proposed building will satisfy the critical need for improved and consolidated space to house a number of agencies now located in scattered leased space and certain Government-owned buildings which are inefficient and obsolete. In view of the specific requirement for a postal station in the immediate vicinity of Eighth and Olive Streets to serve the central business district, we believe that it would be in the best interest of the Government and the public to use the Government-owned site at this location for the proposed building."

This provides no answer to my original question. It does not follow from the fact that there is need for increased Federal office space that the space should be provided on the Eighth and Olive location. It would be cheaper to sell this site and build on another location. Moreover, it would be more efficient in terms of Federal operation if the new building were close to the existing Federal buildings, especially the main post office at 1720 Market, and the new Federal Office Building at 1520 Market. Finally such a decision would fit better into the city's long-range plans. I quote from a letter of Mr. Arthur E. Wright, former executive director of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., in 1960:

"As I believe you know, our organization has for the past several years been anxious to have the Federal Government sell the old post office at Eighth and Olive so this important block can be redeveloped and put back on the tax rolls. This is perhaps the most important single block available for redevelopment in the downtown area and is the real 'key' in our overall program.

"The City Planning Commission of St. Louis has also recommended unanimously that the block now occupied by the old post office be redeveloped along these same general lines—a tall, thin office building combined with an open plaza and underground parking.

"None of this, however, will be attainable unless the Government disposed of the property."

The reason you offer for building on the location of the old Customhouse is the need for adequate mail facilities for the downtown central area. The first thing that comes to mind is the disparity between the amount of square feet needed for the operation of the post office, 14,000 square feet, and the proposed size of the building, "approximately one-half million square feet of interior space." You mentioned that the Post Office Department rejected four bids that were recently submitted. What was the size of each of these bids, and what factors other than cost went into the decision? Have the lease costs contained in the bids been cast against the cost of a new building at Eighth and Olive, as compared to the cost of a building elsewhere in the city? Has the possibility of leasing space in a new but privately owned building at Eighth and Olive been explored? In other words, has the "intensive economic analysis" you promised actually been undertaken? If it has I would appreciate being sent a copy of the data upon which you have based your conclusions rather than the mere repetition of the conclusions themselves. In a word, the planning that has gone into a decision like that to build on Eighth and Olive is one of the primary reasons for the exorbitantly high Federal expenditures with which we are confronted. I think that a proper plan, along the lines I suggested above, would make better use of the land in St. Louis to the fiscal benefit, not only of the Federal Government, but also the St. Louis city government.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: We have carefully reviewed the matters discussed in your letters of August 20 and September 20 to Commissioner Daly of the Public Buildings Service. Following this review, and after again studying the entire space situation in St. Louis, we believe that the best interests of the Government will be served by the construction of a new Federal building on the site of the old customhouse at Eighth and Olive Streets.

The Eighth and Olive Streets property admirably meets the basic criteria which Gen-

erai Services Administration appiies in its selection of sites for proposed Federai buiidings in that it offers maximum convenience and accessibility for both the generai pubiic and empioyees, provides an exceptional opportunity for economic and efficient management of the Government's expanding space needs in St. Louis, and wiii contribute to efficiency and economy in construction, maintenance, and operation. As previousiy indicated, this site satisfies the Post Office Department's specific need for a postai station in the immediate vicinity of Eighth and Oiive Streets. Further, the construction of a multimiiiion-doiiar permanent Federai buiiding with a iife expectancy of not iess than 50 years, shouid be a definite asset to the energetic program which has been undertaken by a group of business peopie in downtown St. Louis to revitaiize the area.

We have checked our records carefuiiy, both in Washington and in our Kansas City regionai office, and find no record of any correspondence with Mr. Arthur E. Wright, Jr., former executive director of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., in which we indicated that we wouid seii the Eighth and Olive Streets site. It is true that when the new Federai office buiiding was approved by the Pubiic Works Committees of the Congress in 1956, it appeared that we would be abie to dispose of the old customhouse. It is aiso true that in correspondence from that time untii the summer of 1962, we indicated that disposai of this property was stiii contemplated. Frequentiy our initiai pians for the housing of Federai agencies in a community change between the time a new building is programed and the date it is actualiy occupied. It is for this reason that we withhoid any finai determination on the retention, conversion, or disposal of existing buiidings untii shortly before the new buiiding is ready for occupancy, at which time we again review the overaii Federai space requirements in the community. Your fiies wiii show that in a ietter dated January 5, 1960, we advised you in the next to the iast paragraph that we wouid again review the overaii space situation in St. Louis before taking final action on disposai of the oid customhouse building.

The question of whether we wiii retain or dispose of a Government-owned buiiding is not one which can be resolved by an arbitrary determination. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, permits the disposai of surplus property oniy when the Administrator of Generai Services determines that such property is not required for the needs and the discharge of the responsibilities of aii Federai agencies. Inasmuch as there exists a definite need for the Eighth and Olive Streets property in order for the Post Office Department and other Federai agencies to discharge their responsibilities, we couid not, even if we were otherwise inciined to do so, dispose of this site. Further, even if this property were surpius to Federai requirements, our reguiations provide that prior to advertising the property for public saie, notice that it is surpius to the needs of the Federai Government must first be given to the Governor of the State in which the property is iocated, to the county cierk, or other appropriate official of the county in which the property is located, and to the mayor or other appropriate officiai of the city or town in which the property is iocated, any of whom, under certain prescribed conditions, may acquire the property at fair market vaiue or at discounts up to 100 percent.

With reference to the present position of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., it is noted that foiiowing our announcement that the site wouid be retained for Federai use, this organization, in a news release dated December 7, 1962, did not object to the construction of a Federai buiiding on this site provided the project were implemented promptiy. In addition, they volunteered that having iarge numbers of Federai empioyees working in the centrai business district wouid be a definite economic asset to the city.

After reviewing the urgent need to consoiidate Federai agencies in St. Louis now housed in ieased space, and in order to provide for the continuing needs of the Post Office Department, in relation to urgently needed pubiic building projects throughout the Nation, we have concluded that we should seek eariy approval from the Public Works Committees of the Congress for a new Federai building to be constructed on the site of the oid customhouse at Eighth and Olive Streets. We have therefore deveioped a prospectus for submission to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after which, if approved, it wiii be referred in January 1964 to the Pubiic Works Committees for consideration under the Pubiic Buildings Act of 1959.

Sincereiy yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

OCTOBER 28, 1963.

Mr. BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOUTIN: I wish to acknowiedge your ietter of September 27, 1963.

It is now quite conciusive the GSA has no ciear reason it is wiiiing to disciose for changing the poiicy decision that had been made by your predecessor in respect to the best utiiization of the oid Custom House site at Eighth and Olive in St. Louis.

The previous decision for the Federai Government to seii this vaiuabie piece of property and acquire a iess costiy site better suited to the Federai Government's use was based upon the sound economics of proper iand utiiization and was in accordance with iongrange city pianning. The Federai Government stood to gain severai miiiions of doiiars as the resuit of this decision. The city of St. Louis stood to gain a considerabie increase in its revenues by returning this property, the most vaiuabie piece of reai estate in the city, to its tax base.

In iight of the faiiure of the GSA to come forward with any understandable explanation of this change in poiicy, I beiieve it would be in the best interests of the Federai Government and the St. Louis metropolitan area that Congress specify that no funds be spent for a new Federai buiiding in St. Louis untii a poiicy approved by the Congress has been adopted.

To say I am deepiy disappointed in the criteria, whatever it may be, which you seem to have estabiished for reaching decisions in the GSA as exempiified by this particuiar case is putting it miidly. The overaii pubiic good is, of course, the oniy proper basis for any pubiic decision and the reasons supporting such decision should always have fuii pubiic disciosure and discussion. To mereiy reiterate that the GSA has rendered a judgment without setting forth the criteria for the judgment, as aii of your ietters on this point have done, is insufficient pubiic disciosure.

Sincereiy,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our very able and distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], who in my humble judgment is one of the top men in the House, who knows as much about the space program as anybody. I know the membership would like to hear him. I therefore yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to explain to the House what this proposed amendment, that would result in a $200 million cut in funds, would do to our U.S. manned space flight and lunar landing program. As I understand the thrust of that amendment, it is aimed at the LEM, or lunar excursion module, that will permit American astronauts to effect a landing on the surface of the moon. The budget plan of NASA calls for $189.9 million of fiscal year 1965 funds to be obligated for the LEM, and $520.5 million for the command and service modules. Such a cut would, therefore, totally eliminate the lunar excursion module and also affect the rest of the spacecraft effort. Is that correct?

Mr. WYMAN. There are $720 million for space capsules in the appropriation, and there are accumulated funds remaining unexpended amounting to a billion dollars more.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I refer to the specific items that are involved in the proposed reduction. These are correct, are they not?

Mr. WYMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Now it is clear that all of the major contracts for the Apollo project have been underway for several years, including the LEM contract with Grumman Aviation Engineering Corp. To decide to terminate that contract right now could, at best, result in a reduction to NASA appropriation of some $170 million, since there are funds already obligated in fiscal year 1965. But that is an important sum.

Let me mention the economic impact of such a move: Grumman, and its 21 major subcontractors that are responsible for about one-half of the LEM effort, would have to lay off people now employed. Up to 18,000 would be added to the unemployment rolls by this October. This would affect all areas of the country, including New England. And it would not be all. Another $30 million, affecting some 4,000 jobs, would have to be cut from other areas of the Apollo effort.

In addition to that, there will be this problem: Since June 30, NASA has been operating on a continuing resolution. This means that NASA has been spending at the same rate they had been spending for the fiscal year 1964 on the command and service modules programs. This is at the rate of $508.3 million, and for the lunar excursion module, $144.5 million. That means that if we now approve a $200 million cut and NASA in the 2 months has spent at the old rate, the net result will be a much larger cutback to reach the $200 million in the remaining months of this fiscal year.

It is not logical to accept a cut of such magnitude in a single program element; good management dictates that the program as an entirety be reexamined and redirected. But under these conditions, a $200 million reduction can only equal a delay of 2 to 3 years in the manned lunar landing. It would require at least 2 years after canceling the LEM effort to reestablish an operating technical team that would be able to carry on from the point of termination. And each year of delay in the manned lunar landing target date costs the Nation a billion dollars.

I may say to the House that the members of the Science and Astronautics Committee have followed this program very closely. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] we receive monthly briefings on the progress that is made in the development and shakedown of these large installations. We are kept informed of the industrial effort throughout the United States. We are kept posted on the progress of development of launch vehicles and spacecraft and the training of flight and ground operational crews, and we are kept advised about organizational and administrative matters. I have asked Dr. Robert Seamans, the NASA Associate Administrator, and Dr. George Mueller, head of manned space flight, the effect of such a $200 million cut in research and development on NASA management of the manned space program. They agree it would be chaotic.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Does the gentleman believe that a cut of $200 million out of an appropriation of $5,300 million would raise chaos?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes. I understand, however, that what really worries the gentleman from New Hampshire is whether Gemini will work. He keeps harping on his fear that our astronauts will fail to learn the rendezvous technique in time for use in the Apollo program.

If he had spent as much time investigating the space program as have the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I believe he would not be so frightened. Rendezvous in space is a logical next step in the development of space flight. Rendezvous is a precise operation, and it will take some time to develop the necessary skills and experience. But it is no more challenging a task than refueling aircraft in flight.

I have discussed the matter with Dr. Mueller, the head of NASA's manned space flight activity, and he assures me that the necessary guidance accuracy is well within present technology and requires no new breakthrough in research and development.

He tells me that all the facts necessary to rendezvous and docking maneuvers ars known.

The basic philosophy of all of our space programs is that testing is carried out on the ground wherever possible and flight missions are employed only to verify the results of ground tests, using elaborate simulators, to test the docking maneuvers and equipment. I have seen the testing and simulation work in progress. Our committee has been provided with monthly reports of the status of these preparations. I have complete confidence in our astronauts and the NASA team. This is the same team that was so outstandingly successful in the Mercury program. We launched six astronauts into space. Six men carried out their missions. Six men returned safely to earth. There is every reason to expect they will be just as successful in the Gemini program.

Now, I am a Republican too, and I certainly am eager for efficiency and economy. The cut proposed here would be false economy. We should recognize that the contracts in this program have already been let. It is planned well ahead. The cut proposed here today would delay the program 2 to 3 years. Each year of delay in a program of this magnitude adds $1 billion to the cost to the taxpayers. It just does not make sense to reduce this appropriation by $200 million this year if it will cost $2 to $3 billion more in the long run and, incidentally, postpone the time when we will have the proven capability for lunar flight.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I think it might well be pointed out that in the House original figure we appropriated $5,200 million for the space agency, and the Senate increased that by $100 million. In the conference we are bringing back a report which called for a reduction of $50 million in the field of research and development. So there is already $50 million that has been applied in the reduction of the original figure on research and development.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is a very good comment. But let me add that the conference report, carrying the figure of $5,250 million, is $195 million lower than the amount originally requested by the administration in a very tight budget. This is a very serious cut and NASA will have a very difficult time in programing the amount that remains in a way that will permit filling the Nation's needs and commitments in space.

This conference report then is within $50 million of the House amount, which makes it a pretty good conference report to me. So I compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and his subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

(Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the argument of the gentleman from New Hampshire in support of cutting this program because he used these same economy arguments on projects involving photography of the moon. He was wrong then and perhaps he will be wrong again.

My honored colleague has proposed in effect that a man-on-the-moon program should be stretched out, and that a more leisurely pace be adopted. He proposes to reduce the cost of the American taxpayer by withholding funds for the procurement of long-lead time items for Project Apollo until all the answers on the Gemini rendezvous experiment have been thoroughly digested.

He makes this proposal in the name of economy.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics has investigated the economic aspects of a program stretchout—and indeed has looked into the effects of a speedup—in the fiscal 1965 hearings for the NASA authorization bill. The Administrator of NASA, Mr. Webb, was closely questioned on this point. Mr. Webb said, "the ultimate cost will be increased for each year in which the achievement of our goal is delayed." The committee heard that the Office of Manned Space Flight had made a careful study of the effects of a stretched out lunar program. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just said, this study indicates that the cost of lunar exploration would be increased by approximately $1 billion for each year that the landing was delayed. To quote Mr. Webb:

> The program has been planned so it is a well-knit, tight program that can be done in this decade. If we spread it out then overhead encroaches too largely and costs you more money and you also deny yourself the area of technology.

Further, the NASA study indicated that any attempt to speed up the program would also introduce higher total program costs.

Our hearings clearly indicate that the program of minimum cost to the American taxpayer is a program which adheres closely to our established goal of man-on-the-moon by 1970. I therefore urge that the proposed motion to recommit be defeated.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the gentleman might point out that a company in his own district, the Douglas Aircraft Co. went into a very detailed study of this program and of the effects of a stretchout of the program, and as a result of that study they told us it would greatly increase the cost if we stretched out this program.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman give us any assurance that we are ever going to be able to use this lunar excursion module for which $189 million is provided in this year in this bill. Can the gentleman give us any such assurance, until we have tested Gemini and established that we can separate and rejoin space capsules in orbit?

Mr. BELL. I think the gentleman well knows that we have to first get some leadtime developed so that we can develop the module to the point where it can be used, and by the gentleman's act he would in effect be cutting the leadtime so that we would not be able to develop the module in time to achieve our declared goals for Gemini and Apollo.

Mr. WYMAN. Does the gentleman feel that there might be as much as 5 years of leadtime in these appropriations?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Of course, the reason for research and development is to find out what is the correct construction of module for the lunar landing. We will use the research and development money for this purpose If we cut the research and development funds the way that the gentleman from New Hampshire recommends we will never know whether it is the correct construction or the best practical approach for the manned lunar landing. So this is the time to find out, spending the nec-

essary research and development funds in an orderly plan and with adequate leadtimes.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the manager on the part of the House, and other members of the conference committee on the part of the House for the excellent job they have done on this conference report.

I also want to express my concern about the motion that is going to be presented later on to cut back the program. I strongly oppose their attempt to cut back the program. It would be disastrous to our Project Apollo, and the whole space program of the Nation.

Let me say as far as the Republicans on this side of the aisle are concerned, there are a good many members on our Committee on Science and Astronautics, and I am certainly one of them, who have always expressed our position in this House on the side of economy. We are concerned with economy. By the same token, we are not in favor of false economy. It is my firm opinion, if we cut back this program, that is exactly what we would be doing, practicing false economy.

We held extremely extensive hearings in our committee with thousands of pages of testimony being taken. Certainly the committee as a whole, in a bipartisan and a nonpartisan fashion, as has been pointed out, was convinced that the pace at which we are proceeding is a good one; and that we are not involved in a crash program and that the program is a sensible one and that the dollar of the American taxpayers is being wisely spent. I am convinced from the testimony before our committee that to slow down and stretch out the program would increase the cost considerably.

I would like to point this out, which is evident in this program when you work closely with it. It is a program that does require long leadtime. It is a program which is a step-by-step program. It is obvious we need to go to Gemini first to find out how we can best rendezvous, to train our astronauts, to work out our space network. But we need to get on with the lunar excursion module so that it will be ready for follow-on, after Gemini.

All these things are required in a sensible program of finally attaining the lunar goal which we have set for this Nation.

It is true also, that in the development of LEM which has been discussed, the lunar excursion module, we have to begin now to do the designing and to do the planning and the manufacturing so that the lunar excursion module will be ready when the other "building blocks" have been done and then we will be ready to use it in the whole scheme of the lunar journey.

I believe the committees have done an excellent job, both the Appropriations Committee and the authorization committee.

I wish to point out that we have an Oversight Committee which meets with NASA once a month. We go over the program carefully. We see what has been done during the previous month. We are apprised of what money has been spent and committed, and we are brought up to date, so that the House will know, through the NASA Oversight Committee, every month what is going on and whether the program is proceeding in an orderly fashion.

As a member of this Oversight Committee I am certainly convinced it is.

I should like to point out another fact. The cost of Government has increased each year, and has increased with each session of the Congress, yet I believe it is compelling evidence to note that so far as the budget for NASA is concerned the appropriation this year, which we shall vote upon in a few minutes, is almost exactly what it was for last year. In other words, we are not increasing it. We are proceeding at the same pace we authorized a year before. To me this is certainly a compelling argument, that the program is well in hand spending-wise.

After working closely with this program I emphatically say the House ought to support it.

There is one other point I wish to make before I close. We have heard some criticism about "moondoggling" and a trip to the moon as having no sensible part of our space program, but the point of the matter is that what we are doing in space, as a nation, actually is development of powerful engines, development of reliable boosters, developing of spacecraft and training of astronauts. This is the capability we are endeavoring to attain for this Nation, and when we do, as we shall if we continue at our present pace, then we shall be first in space. As a matter of fact, the end product, the final journey to the moon, will merely put to use the other ingredients we learn in the meantime.

I support the program wholeheartedly, I urge my colleagues to vote for this conference report and to oppose and vote down the motion to cut back this program, when it is offered later.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the time is growing short. I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. Thereafter I will yield briefly to the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK]. Then we will move the previous question.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER.]

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was rather surprised by the statement made today that this bill had never received, as to appropriations, a fitting review in the House. I refer Members to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 25, where, on 50-some pages record some 3 hours of general debate; at that time the matter was thoroughly explained and threshed out.

I have made a check as to this independent offices appropriation bill. The NASA item is the only money bill which requires an annual authorization by the Congress before it can be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

This is where the program is explained, and it is here the program is set forth in great detail.

Going to the moon is merely one plateau in the exploration of outer space. The techniques we are developing in doing this will make the exploration of outer space possible.

I have read much written recently by people who, critical of this program, say that we are going too fast, that we have no use for this or that facet of it. These critics imply that this House does not know what is involved in the space effort.

Let me call your attention to the fact that not too many years ago we were greatly concerned with the missile lag. It is only now that we have NASA functioning in an orderly manner that we can say that this will not occur again. The lead times are long in the field of astronautics.

This is no crash program. It is not something that was pulled out of the air. Because there is a lot of money involved, there are those who jump at conclusions and irresponsibly cry "crash program." There is no "crash program" here.

You have been told how the Subcommittee on Oversight functions. It has to see to it that NASA has laid out a well-organized program. Our Committee on Science and Astronautics follows its progress carefully through its Oversight Committee on NASA. It follows it carefully with the other two committees that are set up to handle the authorization bill. The bill is just too big for one committee to handle. However, I think the greatest compliment that has been paid to the Science and Astronautics Committee is that since it began functioning and since it has broken down its activities in three subcommittees, its authorization bill has been adopted in one instance unanimously and in other instances with very few dissenting votes. This is the future of the country and the future of the world. You have just witnessed one of the greatest exploits of all time in the Ranger shot. We are going to send other unmanned craft to the moon before we attempt to land men there. Living in the hostile environment of outer space is one of the things that NASA must thoroughly investigate, study and overcome. This is the process being done.

If the object of NASA's work was merely to put a man on the moon, I would be one of the first to oppose it, but this is merely a step in the great exploration of outer space. We already have parted the curtains behind which space hides her secrets in the area of weather projection and communication. New and challenging vistas have been opened for exploitation. No one can tell what the future holds. If you are going to cut out the lunar module as has been suggested, how can you do this consist-

ently and then not cut out the booster to put it into space? There is no consistency in the argument that has been made against facets of spatial exploration. You have heard all of this before. I personally want to congratulate the Committee on Appropriations that has done its usual thorough job in protecting the interests of the people of this country. I commend them and I thank them and I tell them we will work together with them as we have in the past, to advance the United States interest in science and astronautics.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the able and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to compliment the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and all members of the committee for the consideration the committee has given to the problems of the Federal Aviation Agency. You will recall when the appropriation was before the House, I offered an amendment for myself and as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to try to preserve the operation of the flight service stations as they are now and during this fiscal year. The House approved the amendment preserving the operation of this service. I explained at that time how the reduction of the funds then requested would adversely affect this service. The conferees increased the appropriation for operations by $5 million. This amount will assure the continued operation of the flight service stations as outlined in our committee report filed a few days ago. By this action the amendment that I offered, which was approved, is no longer necessary.

Also I want to take this occasion to compliment and thank the committee for the consideration it has given to the item of research and development for the Federal Aviation Agency. I thought a good case was made by the agency. I know the committee has been concerned with this problem, and I think, after the consideration given by the conference, the entire item will permit the work to continue as scheduled. The committee is to be commended for this. It is to be commended by this House for the consideration it has given to these items, and I again personally thank the chairman and members of the committee for their action.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the genial and able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, amendment 188, which is in technical disagreement will provide $20,109,000 in funds for site acquisition and designs and plans for the GSA, for the public buildings program. As I understand, the intent of this action is to provide funds for a number of projects in a number of States, excluding however, four projects in Washington, D.C., one in Louisiana, and one in Nebraska, the latter two not being authorized, as I understand it; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. There is one that happens to be in my hometown, Grand Rapids, and I am interested to know if it was on the list.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sure that it was approved.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Independent Offices Subcommittee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, for the splendid work which was done on this bill in the House and in conference. We owe the subcommittee and its chairman a deep debt of gratitude for restraining and deferring the proposals for several agencies to expand and construct new buildings in the Greater Washington area.

Although a $26,108,000 appropriation was provided for the construction of a new building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the District of Columbia, it is my hope that this appropriation may mark a turning point in the further establishment of Federal bureaucracy offices in this already congested area. There is no question that the Housing and Home Finance Agency needs the space, but I feel that the decision to provide new space in Washington for this Agency is unwise. It could more effectively operate in any other major large city in America.

The critical congestion of Federal bureaucracy in Washington is well beyond the point of tolerance. Government agencies will function more effectively and their employees will live better where there is more open space.

Frankly, the Housing and Home Finance Agency should have displayed some of its expertise in better housing its own administration.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this bill is $158 million below the Senate figure, but it is almost $136 million over the bill as it left the House.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will permit one quick observation, I would like to recall to the minds of the Members of the House the warning given to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], when he called upon the House to vote for a tax reduction bill. At that time he said this:

> In enacting this revenue bill * * * we are choosing tax reduction as the road toward a larger, more prosperous economy and we are rejecting the road of expenditure increases.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this conference report for the reason that an increase of $136 million over the original House figures is not economy in the operation of this Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for including a much needed item which I had previously recommended to the committee for the construction of a post office and Federal office building at Elk City, Okla., in the amount of $222,400, among other items.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. WYMAN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. WYMAN moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to reduce the amount specified in amendment No. 204 from $4,363,594,000 to $4,163,594,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 114, nays 270, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

YEAS—114

Abbitt	Brown, Ohio	Gathings
Abele	Broyhill, N.C.	Goodling
Adair	Broyhill, Va.	Griffin
Anderson	Bruce	Gross
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cederberg	Hall
	Chamberlain	Halleck
Arends	Clancy	Harrison
Ashbrook	Clausen, Don H.	Harsha
Avery		Harvey, Ind.
Ayres	Cleveland	Hoeven
Baker	Corbett	Horan
Barry	Cunningham	Hutchinson
Becker	Curtis	Jensen
Beermann	Dague	Johansen
Belcher	Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.
Berry	Devine	Jonas
Betts	Dole	Kilburn
Bolton, Oliver P.	Findley	King, N.Y.
	Fino	Kunkel
Bow	Foreman	Kyl
Bray	Frelinghuysen	Laird

Langen	Pillion	Siler
Latta	Poff	Skubitz
Lennon	Quie	Smith, Calif.
Lindsay	Quillen	Snyder
McClory	Reid, Ill.	Stafford
McCulloch	Reid, N.Y.	Taft
McLoskey	Reifel	Talcott
MacGregor	Rhodes, Ariz.	Teague, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.	Rich	Thomson, Wis.
May	Robison	Tuck
Meader	St. George	Tupper
Michel	Saylor	Westland
Minshall	Schadeberg	Whalley
Moore	Schenck	Widnall
Morton	Schneebeli	Williams
Nelsen	Schwengel	Wilson, Ind.
O'Konski	Short	Wyman
Pelly	Sibal	Younger

NAYS—270

Abernethy	Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Garmatz	Murray
Albert	Gary	Natcher
Andrews, Ala.	Giaimo	Nix
Ashley	Gibbons	O'Brien, N.Y.
Aspinall	Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.
Auchincloss	Glenn	O'Hara, Mich.
Baldwin	Gonzalez	Olsen, Mont.
Barrett	Goodell	O'Neill
Bass	Grabowski	Osmers
Bates	Grant	Ostertag
Battin	Gray	Patman
Beckworth	Green, Oreg.	Patten
Bell	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Bennett, Fla.	Griffiths	Perkins
Blatnik	Grover	Philbin
Boggs	Gubser	Pickle
Boland	Gurney	Pike
Bolling	Hagen, Calif.	Pilcher
Bonner	Halpern	Pirnie
Brademas	Hanna	Poage
Brock	Hansen	Pool
Bromwell	Harding	Price
Brooks	Hardy	Pucinski
Broomfield	Harris	Purcell
Brotzman	Hawkins	Rains
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Randall
Burke	Hébert	Reuss
Burkhalter	Hechler	Rhodes, Pa.
Burleson	Henderson	Riehlman
Burton, Calif.	Herlong	Rivers, Alaska
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Roberts, Ala.
Cahill	Holland	Roberts, Tex.
Carey	Horton	Rodino
Casey	Huddleston	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Hull	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Ichord	Rogers, Tex.
Chenoweth	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Jennings	Rooney, Pa.
Clawson, Del	Joelson	Roosevelt
Collier	Johnson, Calif.	Rosenthal
Colmer	Johnson, Wis.	Rostenkowski
Conte	Jones, Mo.	Roudebush
Cooley	Karsten	Roush
Corman	Karth	Roybal
Cramer	Kastenmeier	Rumsfeld
Curtin	Keith	Ryan, N.Y.
Daddario	Kelly	St Germain
Daniels	Keogh	St. Onge
Davis, Ga.	Kilgore	Schweiker
Davis, Tenn.	King, Calif.	Secrest
Dawson	Kirwan	Senner
Delaney	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Dent	Knox	Shriver
Denton	Kornegay	Sickles
Derounian	Libonati	Sikes
Diggs	Lipscomb	Sisk
Donohue	Long, La.	Slack
Dorn	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Dowdy	McDade	Smith, Va.
Downing	McDowell	Springer
Dulski	McFall	Staggers
Duncan	McIntire	Steed
Dwyer	McMillan	Stephens
Edmondson	Macdonald	Stinson
Edwards	Madden	Stratton
Elliott	Mahon	Stubblefield
Ellsworth	Marsh	Sullivan
Everett	Martin, Mass.	Taylor
Evins	Matsunaga	Teague, Tex.
Fallon	Matthews	Thomas
Farbstein	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Tex.
Fascell	Milliken	Tollefson
Feighan	Mills	Trimble
Finnegan	Minish	Tuten
Fisher	Monagan	Udall
Flood	Montoya	Ullman
Fogarty	Moorhead	Utt
Ford	Morgan	Van Deerlin
Fountain	Morris	Vanik
Fraser	Morrison	Van Pelt
Friedel	Morse	Vinson
Fulton, Pa.	Mosher	Waggonner
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	Wallhauser
Fuqua	Multer	Watts
	Murphy, Ill.	Weaver
Weltner	Wickersham	Wright
Wharton	Willis	Wydler
White	Wilson, Bob	Young
Whitener	Wilson, Charles H.	Zablocki
Whitten		

NOT VOTING—46

Alger	Harvey, Mich.	Norblad
Ashmore	Healey	Olson, Minn.
Baring	Hoffman	Passman
Bolton, Frances P.	Hosmer	Powell
	Jones, Ala.	Rivers, S.C.
Buckley	Kee	Ryan, Mich.
Burton, Utah	Landrum	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Lankford	Selden
Cameron	Leggett	Shipley
Cohelan	Lesinski	Staebler
Dingell	Lloyd	Thompson, La.
Flynt	Mailliard	Thompson, N.J.
Forrester	Martin, Calif.	Toll
Gill	Mathias	Watson
Hagan, Ga.	Miller, N.Y.	Winstead
Haley	Nedzi	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Martin of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Cameron with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Passman.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 15, line 23, insert:

"Funds appropriated under this or any other Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Agency may be expended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Agency, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Agency may be expended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Agency, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 186: Page 33, line 16, insert: "and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the border station facility at Derby Line, Vermont, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962, is hereby increased by $183,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 187: Page 33, line 21, insert: "Not to exceed $120,000 heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Construction, Public Buildings Projects', in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, may be transferred to the appropriation for 'Construction, United States Mission Building, New York, New York', for the payment of contractor's claims."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 188: Page 34, line 4, insert:

"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, $33,200,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$20,109,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 208: Page 48, line 9, insert:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without the consent of the Congress."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 220: Page 56, line 9, insert: *"Provided further,* That, in addition, not to exceed $200,000,000 of unobligated balances of said Direct loans revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amount as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

STATUE OF FATHER EUSEBIO FRANCISCO KINO

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document, with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, of Arizona, presented by the State of Arizona; and that there be printed five thousand additional copies, of which two thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and for the use of the Senators from the State of Arizona, three thousand copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the use of the Representatives in Congress from the State of Arizona.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer and shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SCHOOL PRAYER HEARINGS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the House Concurrent Resolution 336 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, four thousand additional copies each, to be printed concurrently with the publications entitled "Proposed Amendments to the Constitution Relating to Prayer and Bible Reading in the Public Schools, Hearings Before the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, parts 1, 2, and 3", Eighty-eighth Congress, second session.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEMS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 330 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, three thousand five hundred additional copies of volumes I and II of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, entitled "The Federal Reserve System After Fifty Years", dated January 21, 22, 23, 29, and 30; and February 3, 4, 5, and 6, 1964; and February 11, 25, and 26, and March 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 25, 1964, respectively.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 346, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, three thousand five hundred additional copies of volume III of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, entitled "The Federal Reserve System After Fifty Years", dated April 9, 13, 14, 16, 22, and 29, 1964.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 176, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities eight thousand additional copies of the committee's annual report for the year 1962, House Report Numbered 176, Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENTS THE PUBLICATIONS "WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT—SELECTIVE CHRONOLOGY, 1818–1957, VOLUME 2 AND VOLUME 3"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 348 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publications entitled "World Communist Movement—Selective Chronology, 1818–1957, Volume 2, 1946–1950; and Volume 3, 1951–1953" prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Eighty-eighth Congress, be printed as House documents; and that there be printed ten thousand additional copies of said documents for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATION "COMMUNIST ECONOMIC WARFARE—CONSULTATION WITH DR. ROBERT LORING ALLEN, APRIL 6, 1960"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 826 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities thirty-seven thousand additional copies of a publication entitled "Communist Economic Warfare—Consultation With Doctor Robert Loring Allen, April 6, 1960".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "THE IRRATIONALITY OF COMMUNISM—CONSULTATION WITH DR. GERHART NIEMEYER, AUGUST 8, 1958"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 827 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities thirty-three additional copies of a publication entitled "The Irrationality of Communism—Consultation With Doctor Gerhart Niemeyer, August 8, 1958".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "A COMMUNIST IN A 'WORKERS' PARADISE'—JOHN SANTO'S OWN STORY"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 828 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities nine thousand additional copies of a publication entitled "A Communist in a 'Workers' Paradise'—John Santo's Own Story", Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF A "COMPILATION OF WORKS OF ART AND OTHER OBJECTS IN THE U.S. CAPITOL"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 350, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document a "Compilation of Works of Art and Other Objects in the United States Capitol", prepared under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol; and that there be printed thirty-seven thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and five thousand for the use of the Architect of the Capitol.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ACT OF 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 841, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12175) to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H.R. 12175, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3049 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 12175 as passed by the House.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume, at the conclusion of which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 841 provides for consideration of H.R. 12175, a bill to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, waiving points of order, and making it in order after passage of H.R. 12175 to take S. 3049 from the Speaker's table, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House-passed language.

Generally, H.R. 12175 would provide additional authorizations and funds to continue existing federally assisted housing programs for another year. In addition, the bill contains a number of amendments designed to improve FHA sales and rental housing programs and to improve the operation of the urban renewal program. The bill's major features are as follows:

Title I of the bill would permit lower downpayments and higher mortgage amounts on FHA sales housing, and would provide additional protection against foreclosure for FHA homeowners.

Title II would authorize additional funds for low-interest direct loans for rental housing for the elderly, and would provide new housing aids for the handicapped.

Title III would, first, authorize an additional $600 million for grants under the urban renewal program; second, tighten the urban renewal program requirements to encourage more rehabilitation and code enforcement; third, provide a new program of rehabilitation loans to aid homeowners and businesses in urban renewal areas to improve their properties; and, fourth, tighten relocation requirements and provide additional relocation benefits to displaced businesses, nonprofit organizations, individuals, and families.

Title IV would authorize 35,000 additional units of low-rent public housing.

Title V would authorize an additional $150 million for direct loans under the rural housing program administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Title VI would authorize a limited grant program to encourage on-the-job training and short-term courses of instruction to provide the skills needed for local administration of urban programs.

Title VII would provide an additional $20 million for the public works planning advance program.

Title VIII would broaden the investment authority of savings and loan associations.

Title IX would provide an additional $25 million for grants for the open space—parks and playgrounds—program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 841.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] has explained rather cogently the provisions of House Resolution 841. It provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12175, the so-called housing bill, the extension of the Housing Act to fiscal 1965. It provides for 2 hours of general debate, following which the measure will be open for the offering of amendments under the 5-minute rule.

This is a rather complicated piece of legislation, or probably I should describe it as being a comprehensive piece of legislation, because it would spend for the balance of this fiscal year, 1965, or for about 10 months from the time the bill would be signed into law additional appropriations amounting to about $1 billion.

The bill itself, on which very curtailed or short hearings were held before the Rules Committee, consists of some 78 pages. The report on the bill, which I recommend be read by Members, consists of 125 pages. The bill and the report came from the Committee on Banking and Currency to the members of the Rules Committee one evening about 5:30 or 6, and I think we remained in session until 8:30 that night. The next morning we were asked to hold a hearing and report the measure in 30 minutes; a procedure to which some of us objected because we wanted to find out at least what the cost would be.

I asked the sponsor of the bill, the chairman of the committee, what the

11. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 17. p. 191905

HOUSE - Aug. 15

12. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees agreed to file a report on this bill, H. R. 11134. p. D702

SENATE - Aug. 14

13. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11296, and concurred in House amendments to two items in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 18929-34

14. HOUSING. Disagreed to the House amendment to S. 3049, the housing bill. Conferees were appointed. pp. 18980-90

15. POVERTY. Sen. Simpson inserted an article critical of the poverty bill. pp. 18920-1

16. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on H. R. 11380, the foreign-aid authorization bill. pp. 18935-49, 18954-68, 18993-9, 19001-12

17. NATIONAL PARK. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 16, establishing the Ozark National Rivers, Mo. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 18999-19000

Passed without amendment H. R. 946, to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site, Ariz. This bill will mow be sent to the President. p. 19001

18. ELECTRIFICATION. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 502, to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 19000-1

19. ACCOUNTING. Passed without amendment H. R. 10446, to permit the use of statistical sampling procudures in the examination of vouchers. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 19014

20. CLAIMS. Passed as reported H. R. 6910, to provide for the settlement of claims against the U. S. by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the U. S. for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service. p. 19014

Received a letter from this Department reporting tort claims paid in fiscal year 1964; to Judiciary Committee. p. 18903

21. CONTAINERS. Passed without amendment H. R. 9334, to amend the Standard Container Act of 1928 relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, so as to permit the use of additional standard containers. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 19015

22. ECONOMICS. Sen. Humphrey inserted his statement supporting S. 2274, to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission. pp. 19018-20

23. HOLIDAY. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 108, making Columbus Day a legal holiday (S. Rept. 1438). p. 18903

24. VEHICLES. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 1341, to re-

quire passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards (S. Rept. 1440). p. 18903

25. EDUCATION. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) an original bill, the higher education student assistance bill of 1964. p. D697

SENATE - Aug. 15

26. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8070, to establish a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the U. S. (S. Rept. 1444). p. 19108

27. AUDIT. Passed without amendment H. R. 4223, to provide for an audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 19133

28. HOLIDAY. Passed without amendment S. 108, making Columbus Day a legal holiday. p. 19136

29. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on H. R. 11380, the foreign-aid authorization bill. pp. 19123-8, 19140-5, 19147-50

30. FISH PROTEIN. Sen. Douglas urged approval for sale of high protein fish concentrate. pp. 19116-7

31. PAY. Sen. Johnston inserted the remarks of President Johnson when he signed the pay bill. p. 19151

32. EXPOSITIONS. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 162, authorizing the President to call upon the States and foreign countries in the International Exposition for southern Calif. p. 19128

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

33. MEAT IMPORTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Burke opposing the meat-import restriction bill, and stating "the rigid import bill will not help the cattlemen and at the same time it will adversely affect our farm and industrial exports." pp. A4313-4

34. HOLIDAY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Carey expressing his support for the bill to make Columbus Day a national holiday. pp. A4316-7

35. APPALACHIA; ROADS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor inserting correspondence with the Dept. of Commerce concerning his proposal that all highways in the Appalachia region be constructed on a 90-percent Federal and 10-percent State ration. pp. A4319-20

36. POVERTY. Rep. Edmondson inserted Sargent Shriver's address before Georgetown University in which he discussed the Peace Corps and the proposed poverty program. pp. A4324-6

37. FOOD STAMPS. Rep. Sullivan inserted an article, "Congress Clears Food Stamp Plan for the Needy--Nationwide Program Would Provide Assistance for Any Area Asking It." p. A4330

and now the Nurse Training Act, school administrators should consider all applicants equally. Such impartial administration will be necessary if Alaskan nursing students, and ultimately the entire State, are to receive the full benefits which the bill promises.

FOREIGN AID LOANS SHOULD BEAR INTEREST

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senate this week took a long, forward step toward putting our so-called AID program on a basis that makes it defensible and puts it on an economic basis that makes sense in an era when there appears to be no termination date in sight when the United States will no longer be called upon to help other countries develop effective resistance against Communist influences and aggression.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the first page of my biweekly report to South Dakotans on the activities of Congress, which is issued under the heading of "Your Washington and You."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOAN IS A LOAN

Foreign aid loans are much nearer to becoming just that—loans—than ever before as a result of Senate action this past week. By a 50 to 38 rollcall vote, the Senate approved my amendment (cosponsored by Senators LAUSCHE, MORSE, and DOMINICK) to increase interest rates and reduce the amortization period of Agency for International Development (AID) loans. Basic provisions: commercial type loans, those used for developing profitmaking enterprises, would carry an interest rate equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States (approximately 3¾ percent now) plus a one-fourth of 1 percent carrying charge, with the repayment period of 25 years to begin when the commercial installation has been completed. Noncommercial loans, such as those for schools, highways, water systems, etc., would carry an interest rate of 2½ percent annually with repayment to be completed within 25 years.

The "interest rate amendment" has followed a rocky path in the 7 years since the late Senator Bridges and I first proposed it as a "language rider" in the Senate Appropriations Committee. The initial effort resulted in the requirement that "an appropriate rate" of interest be established on foreign aid loans. This was determined by the State Department to be a mere three-fourths of 1 percent which, along with a repayment period of 40 years, did little more than disguise grants as loans. New amendments to increase the rate were proposed. Sometimes they were defeated in committee. Sometimes they lost in the Senate. Sometimes AID officials got the message as each year Congress came closer and closer to accepting the concept that a loan should bear legitimate rates of interest and be paid back in regular annual payments and, by administrative action, moved in that direction. Then, last year, a change got through Congress which provided that a minimum interest rate of 2 percent be charged after a 10-year grace period during which interest may be (and usually is) as low as three-fourths of 1 percent. The 40-year repayment period remained.

Last week's action marks, by far, the strongest step taken to date by the Senate in hardening U.S. loan terms. House approval will mean achievement of a significant reform. In all events, the 50–38 Senate vote means that never again will grants and handouts be disguised as loans since the Senate finally signaled, clearly, that it wants a sharp distinction between grants and loans; that it prefers loans to grants; and that a loan should bear realistic rates of interest, and repayment should not be jeopardized or made highly unlikely by the devise of a grace period of a decade or more before a repayment schedule becomes operative.

PERHAPS IT CHANGED SOME VOTES

During debate on the interest rate amendment I cited an example of how "grants disguised as loans" actually can be utilized most profitably by recipient countries. AID granted a loan directly to Premier Automobiles, Ltd. of India but, under a special procedure, permitted the company to repay to the Government of India the loan and India, in turn, repay it to us. Our terms to India were very liberal: a 10-year grace period, than 40 years to repay at three-quarters of 1 percent interest. The Indian Government however, was a bit more tight-fisted when the borrowed dollars became their lending dollars. Premier Auto must repay the loan to India over a 15-year period, only 2 years' grace, and at 5¾ percent interest.

SPRAY FROM THE POTOMAC

Some Democrat convention planners wish L.B.J. had picked Bob Kennedy for the Veep candidacy. Now they are not sure how they will refer to R.F.K.—as the candidate for Senate from New York or as the delegate from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALINGER. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11296) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 12, 1964, pp. 18588–18590, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 11296, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 186, 187, 208, and 220 to the bill (H.R. 11296) entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

"Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Agency may be expended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Agency, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert '$20,109,000.'"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 28 and 188.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, again I wish to point out what fine work the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], did in relation to the conference and the bill. The record of economy that we have been able to achieve in relation to most parts of the bill is one which could well be emulated. I would be extremely remiss if I did not mention it at this time and pay my tribute to the Senator for his part in that achievement.

There were two conferences on the bill. To give some idea of the magnitude of the task, we considered approximately 230 amendments, all of which had to be studied by the conferees. Perhaps 100 of them could be considered en bloc, but approximately 138 amendments remained to be considered individually by the conferees.

I must also mention the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for he was particularly helpful in the conference.

On page 13 of the report reference is made to the appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Board. The managers on the part of the House of Representatives pointed out that the conferees had allowed $3,358,000 for a subsidy for helicopter operations instead of the $3 million proposed by the House, and the $4,300,000 approved by the Senate.

Mr. President we have wrestled with the problem of subsidies for helicopter operations every year for many years. I feel that I am in a position to speak objectively about it, because if further certificates are to be authorized, several cities in the United States would have to be considered before the subsidy would become available to any city in my own State.

For that reason I believe I have been able to approach the problem objectively and constructively, and to look at it in a different way from those who have been under constant pressure in their own States and their own cities to promote helicopter operations.

The conference report states:

> The conferees have been wrestling many years with continuing subsidies for helicopter service for 3 cities while 39 other cities need it as badly as those that now have it. This is the last money to be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively. The conferees respectfully request the CAB not to include one penny for these three lines in its budget next year. This position is unanimously agreed to by the House conferees and a majority of the conferees of the Senate.

Mr. President, before the conference was concluded, I was obliged to leave for an important appointment with a gentleman who can always be very important—a dentist—and consequently I did not attend the full session of the conference. I have stated the language arrived at, and I should like to state the reason why I devote myself to the question now.

First, I do not think it is for the conference committee to say that the appropriation will be the last money that will be recommended by the committee for these projects exclusively. To do so would be to preempt the prerogatives of the committee next year. I do not believe that we can do that or intend to do that. At least the Senator from Colorado does not intend to do it.

Second, the language of the report specifically ignores a fact which we cannot get away from, and that is that in the particular terminals served by helicopters they are not particularly serving the cities. At least 80 percent of the people served are people in transit from those cities to other cities or from other cities to the terminals at which the service is provided. So it is not a service to the cities. If we wish fully to understand the problem, we must consider helicopter operations in the same category and in the same way that we would consider the relationship of a trunk carrier and a local service carrier.

One is merely a continuation of the other. That is what is involved.

The question of what a member of a conference committee does has been debated and discussed on the floor many, many times. I am not critical of other Senators on the conference committee whose views differed from mine, but I point out that, by a vote of 57 to 32, the Senate kept the provision relating to helicopter provisions in the bill. When we reached the conference, the committee happened to be so constituted that the majority of the Senators on it were in favor of the House position and the House language.

My real purpose in commenting on this matter today is that I feel we are ending an era in the development of helicopters. They will have to prove that they can operate on their own. I am not in favor of a sudden death proposal with respect to these subsidies. In the first place, the Government has guaranteed loans for the purchase of helicopters, so if they were put out of business immediately, which could be the situation if there were a sudden death action, the Government would have some helicopters on its hands. I do not know what it would do with them.

Second, I offered a compromise in committee to downgrade the subsidies, with a full subsidy this year, half next year, and a full termination the year thereafter. Others on the committee disagreed. They are perfectly entitled to their views.

I think it is well to point out again that through the three helicopter operations we have come a greater distance in the development of this particular type of aircraft than we could have done any other way. While it is true that the total subsidies have cost the Government some $46 million to date, the testimony before the committee last year by the military representatives themselves was to the effect that the saving to the military arising from these operations alone came close to $100 million. I am sorry I have not the exact figure, but the amount is substantially more than the amount of subsidies to date.

We now face the future with this report. I want to make it clear that the Senator from Colorado does not agree with the report. I am inclined to think, although I cannot speak for him, that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who was a member of the committee, was not for it.

I could not let this moment pass and let stand the language written by the House, not by the Senate, without commenting on it and making my own position clear.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Colorado has spoken in a way which must be very encouraging to people like myself. It is said that it is always darkest before the dawn. One has the feeling that this sudden withdrawal—with the CAB proposing a phasing-out period of 5 years, and the Senator considering a phasing-out period of 2 years—seems to be precipitate and ill advised. I have an interest in the matter. There is a helicopter service in New York. However, that concern must be, and is subordinate to our overall responsibility with respect to what Congress does with the taxpayers' money.

I have examined in some detail the testimony before the committee as to these helicopter operations.

I wish to disassociate myself from the sudden ukase to the effect that "this is the end." I would welcome an orderly program of liquidating the subsidies. I believe that the outside limit of 5 years, which has been proposed by the CAB would give adequate opportunity and room for maneuvering in order to liquidate the subsidies in an orderly fashion.

I cannot agree with the language which our colleagues in the other body have adopted, any more than the Senator from Colorado can, because I feel continued effective operation of essential helicopter services will be in the interest of the United States, and that in the development of helicopter transportation lies a possible answer to one of the significant mass transportation problems for the future, especially in our major cities.

So I wish to express my unhappiness with the language placed in the conference report. I pledge to the committee, and to my colleague from Colorado, in deference to his profound and helpful understanding of the situation, that I will do whatever I can personally to look into this aspect of the CAB's program as it affects New York, and will use my own best talents to come back to my colleagues with some solid recommendations and proof as to what is desirable.

I assure my colleague from Colorado that I greatly value his support and that I will give the problem my best attention. In deference to the Senator's fine assistance in this matter, I will endeavor to come back with a recommendation for which he can at least have respect.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator for his remarks. I am sure he will be of great help next year.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAGNUSON] has sat with us year after year in the consideration of this problem, and I have been pleased to sit beside him, when we have gone into this question. I assure the distinguished Senator from New York that we have examined the financial statements and progress of the companies meticulously year by year, in an attempt to determine what is the best thing.

The language of the report seems to throw an alternative at us; namely, that we either chop off the subsidies at once or else grant 10 or 15 or 20 certificates to others.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. MAGNUSON] is also chairman of the Commerce Committee. Perhaps he may have to devote his attention to this matter legislatively, because, in my opinion, it would be a very great mistake at this point of development, when we are still trying to prove the economic feasibility of these operations, to expand into 5, 10, 15, or 20 other services.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I omitted to express my gratitude and that of the people in the metropolitan area around New York for the way the committee fought to carry the program forward. We would never have won the contest in the Senate had it not been for the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY],

and other Senators who were sympathetic toward the problem involved.

I do not wish, in the excitement of the moment, to omit saying that carrying out of the helicopter program was also largely the result of the distinguished work of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and my able colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Senator JAVITS and I have had a longstanding interest in the helicopter item of this bill from year to year. Despite the fact that, for obvious reasons, helicopter service affects us in New York parochially, in the old-fashioned sense of that word, I have always tried and I think succeeded in maintaining a sense of detachment which would permit me to carefully weigh all sides of the question, including the not inconsiderable stake of the Nation's taxpayers.

When this bill was first before us in the Senate a short time ago, I spoke approvingly of the plans of the Appropriations Committee to reexamine the entire helicopter question next year which is the position reiterated today by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I am reconciled to the fact that we are fast approaching the end of an era which might aptly be dubbed the experimental phase of helicopter carrier operations, and that we must be prepared to make a new policy determination on where we go from here. It may well be that a thorough review would lead to a conclusion that the helicopter carriers must be left to their own devices without reliance on Federal payments. It may well be, on the other hand, that the time is ripe for expansion of service to even more metropolitan areas, under different provisions for a Federal contribution. Whatever the case, however, I know that the members of the Appropriations Committee, and of the Commerce Committee which has jurisdiction of the substantive regulations in the Federal Aviation Act, would give their most fair and thorough consideration to the problem. That, in my judgment, would be the orderly way to deal with the future fate of helicopter service in this country.

Now, Mr. President, along comes this conference report, representing the views of the House conferees and some of our Senate conferees, but in any event the views of only a minority of the legislative and Appropriations Committees that have to deal with the problem, and proclaims, by ipse dixit, that not one penny shall go into this item starting next year.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this is an unfortunate statement. It is unfortunate because it seems to me to threaten utter disorder in dealing with a complex subject. It seems to me to be in disregard of the serious consequences that would ensue if the presently authorized three carriers were denied Federal contributions at a single stroke—consequences comparable to the severity of the reaction upon a drug addict of complete and abrupt withdrawal from drugs. In brief, it could be disastrous.

Helicopter service has been of benefit to the military. It has been of benefit to interstate and foreign commerce. It has helped the postal service. It has had its part to play in lubricating the wheels of business, and in providing an ancillary service to tourism. It holds out great hopes of meeting other serious problems, most prominently that of urban congestion. It has, in a word, a potential for new strides forward, for growth, for meeting needs in new markets that may shortly be able to pay their own way.

So I believe firmly that any guillotining of this item would be a serious mistake. If the Federal Government is to withdraw its support, it must do so in a sane and orderly way. It must have a policy, too, to take the place of its present one. It must give due regard to the private investment in these companies, to their employees, and to the public service benefits that are at stake both in the immediate areas concerned and for the whole country.

The conference report does not give regard to these vital factors, and I deeply regret that it does not. If I am in a position to do so, I will certainly oppose in every way I can the abrupt abandonment of a policy in favor of no policy at all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his very kind remarks. I suggest that if what he has said about me is true, the same applies to him. This is a long, complex bill, and required a great deal of mental "gear shifting" to bring it into shape. We also had some very able staff members who were of great help, particularly Mr. Earl Cooper, who is very conversant with this subject.

Most of us have to devote our efforts almost exclusively to the problems involved in the independent offices appropriation bill.

It is extremely complex. It is a large bill. We wound up several million dollars under the budget. In most cases, the Senator from Colorado and I kept the agencies at the same personnel employment level, and in other cases we reduced them. We started that practice about 4 years ago. We find that the agencies are functioning very well. Parkinson, perhaps, will write a new chapter in his book about both of us, although I am not sure he will.

The RECORD should show that we are $797,794,000 under the budget. If I say so myself, that is an achievement for the Senator from Colorado and me.

We have been arguing about a very small portion of the $800 million that we saved. We made a cut in the helicopter operation of approximately a million dollars.

I join the Senator from Colorado in what he had to say, that this language is the House language. That is correct.

The majority of the Senate conferees agreed with the House in what is in the report. The Senator from Colorado and I and two or three other Senators did not agree. It is a matter with which we shall have to contend. I am hopeful that the Committee on Commerce will take a long look at this problem next year, because we feel the operations are necessary and vital to the transportation system of the United States and the public; and the operation promises a great future.

The use of helicopters in the next 10 years, privately and publicly, in our transportation system, will expand 10 or 15 times. Helicopters are becoming safer and technologically more useful every day. We must fit helicopters into our transportation system, no matter what anyone thinks. How to do it is the problem we shall have to meet.

The Senate should know that one of the other items which was in complete disagreement between the House and the Senate was amendment No. 188. It provided about $32 million for sites and planning for public buildings, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration.

The House cut out all the items, and the Senate put back the items recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration. The conference devoted a great deal of time to this item, dealing with sites and planning for public buildings throughout the country. As the Senator from Colorado knows, we appropriate about $175 million a year. It varies between $165 million and $180 million—for public buildings. This is in a budget of $100 billion. We spend less, proportionately, in our budget for public buildings than any other country in the world. Public buildings are needed in our great, expanding economy and the increasing population situation. The General Services Administration is extremely meticulous. They bring up sites and planning requests only when certain criteria are met.

I cite the situation in my own city of Seattle, where we are renting 975,000 square feet of space, scattered all over, for Federal operations. Therefore, a public building would be justified in that case. It would amortize itself in x number of years. The General Services Administration criterion is 15 years, I believe. There are no political implications involved. The Senator from Colorado and I never know what buildings will be recommended until the budget is brought up. We very seldom change the recommendation, because there is a backlog.

The House suggested that there was too much of a backlog. It said that there was a backlog of 2 or 3 years, and that we should slow up this year and not prepare the sites and plan the buildings for funding operations and construction contracts. We disagreed. We thought we should proceed. There is about a 2-year backlog in connection with many of these sites. It requires almost 2 years to get them ready for funding.

I see in the Chamber the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I am sure he knows about the big Federal office building that was erected in Chicago. It took almost 5 or 6 years to prepare for construction. That proves the wisdom of having these projects ready. We finally agreed to three-fourths of the

sites and planning operations. The recommendations for sites and planning for the District of Columbia were mainly set aside until next year. There was good reason for this. There has been a great building boom in the District of Columbia, and the occupancy time of some of the buildings will not be prejudiced.

We must decide whether we should continue to put all the buildings in the District of Columbia or whether there might be some kind of dispersal. The buildings outside the District of Columbia, scattered all over the width and breadth of the United States, are needed. We ended with $20 million for all of the United States. That is a modest amount when we consider the size of the country and the critical need for some of the buildings.

After full discussion in the conference we came away with a very fair figure, consistent with the economies that the Senator from Colorado and I believe the agencies should practice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a table showing the action taken on each item in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965 (H.R. 11296)

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1965

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL								
Salaries and expenses	$525,000	$525,000	$500,000	$500,000	$500,000	−$25,000		
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING								
Salaries and expenses	4,695,000	5,700,000	4,285,000	4,855,000	4,600,000	−1,100,000	+$315,000	−$255,000
State and local prepardness	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000			
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies	4,190,000	6,500,000	4,190,000	4,190,000	4,190,000	−2,310,000		
Total, Office of Emergeney Planning	10,385,000	13,700,000	9,975,000	10,545,000	10,290,000	−3,410,000	+315,000	−255,000
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY								
Salaries and expenses	880,000	950,000	880,000	950,000	900,000	−50,000	+20,000	−50,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	11,790,000	15,175,000	11,355,000	11,995,000	11,690,000	−3,485,000	+335,000	−305,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Disaster relief	70,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
CIVIL DEFENSE								
Operation and maintenance	70,319,000	92,400,000	70,000,000	85,000,000	75,000,000	−17,400,000	+5,000,000	−10,000,000
Research, shelter survey and marking	41,250,000	(142,300,000)	19,200,000	69,200,000	30,200,000	+30,200,000	+11,000,000	−39,000,000
Shelter, construction, and research and development		265,600,000				−265,600,000		
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense	111,569,000	358,000,000	89,200,000	154,200,000	105,200,000	−252,800,000	+16,000,000	−49,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Emergency health activities	27,500,000	9,507,000	8,500,000	9,250,000	8,875,000	−632,000	+375,000	−375,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD								
Salaries and expenses	10,240,000	10,775,000	10,440,000	10,775,000	10,607,500	−167,500	+167,500	−167,500
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization)	83,000,000	82,824,000	79,000,000	86,124,000	82,500,000	−324,000	+3,500,000	−3,624,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	93,240,000	93,599,000	89,440,000	96,899,000	93,107,500	−491,500	+3,667,500	−3,791,500
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	21,805,000	22,187,000	21,805,000	22,187,000	21,996,000	−191,000	+191,000	−191,000
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations	600,000	634,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	−34,000		
Annuities under special acts	1,800,000	1,700,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000			
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund	9,500,000	10,664,000	10,650,000	10,650,000	10,650,000	−14,000		
Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund	14,800,000	14,840,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	−40,000		
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund	62,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000			
Administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund (limitation)	(270,000)	(277,000)	(270,000)	(277,000)	(273,500)	(−3,500)	(+3,500)	(−3,500)
Total, Civil Service Commission	110,505,000	115,025,000	114,505,000	114,887,000	114,696,000	−329,000	+191,000	−191,000

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965 (H.R. 11296)—Continued

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I								
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY								
Operations	$528,000,000	$547,600,000	$537,600,000	$544,100,000	$542,600,000	−$5,000,000	+$5,000,000	−$1,500,000
Facilities and equipment	100,250,000	75,000,000	50,000,000	66,000,000	50,000,000	−25,000,000		−16,000,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)	20,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000			
Grants-in-aid for airports, 1965		75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000			
Grants-in-aid for airports, 1966		75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000			
Research and development	40,000,000	42,000,000	21,000,000	42,000,000	40,000,000	−2,000,000	+19,000,000	−2,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	3,581,500	3,631,000	3,530,000	3,600,000	3,565,000	−66,000	+35,000	−35,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	3,985,000	4,619,000	4,319,000	4,319,000	4,319,000	−300,000		
Construction, Washington National Airport	2,075,000	1,800,000	1,620,000	1,800,000	1,710,000	−90,000	+90,000	−90,000
Construction, Dulles International Airport	450,000	200,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	−20,000		
Civil supersonic aircraft development	60,000,000							
Total, Federal Aviation Agency	758,341,500	831,850,000	775,249,000	818,999,000	799,374,000	−32,476,000	+24,125,000	−19,625,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	15,600,000	16,610,000	16,310,000	16,460,000	16,385,000	−225,000	+75,000	−75,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	11,850,000	13,335,000	12,180,000	12,699,000	12,439,500	−895,500	+259,500	−259,500
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	12,214,750	13,270,000	12,725,000	13,025,000	12,875,000	−395,000	+150,000	−150,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	210,875,000	224,570,000	213,800,000	224,570,000	219,185,000	−5,385,000	+5,385,000	−5,385,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings	75,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000			
Construction, public buildings projects	157,600,800	169,613,400	151,722,000	161,247,500	153,167,000	−16,446,400	+1,445,000	−8,080,500
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	40,000,000	29,500,000		33,200,000	20,109,000	−9,391,000	+20,109,000	−13,091,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	5,200,000	9,885,000	9,885,000	9,885,000	9,885,000			
Expenses, U.S. court facilities	1,030,600	1,464,000	1,030,600	1,030,600	1,030,600	−433,400		
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	46,000,000	54,085,000	48,920,000	52,420,000	50,670,000	−3,415,000	+1,750,000	−1,750,000
General supply fund	30,000,000							
Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(9,387,500)	(10,052,000)	(9,512,500)	(9,512,500)	(9,512,500)	(−539,500)		
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	14,730,000	15,410,000	14,955,000	15,155,000	15,055,000	−355,000	+100,000	−100,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	4,850,000	6,000,000	5,465,000	5,765,000	5,465,000	−535,000		−300,000
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(23,925,000)	(18,090,000)	(17,755,000)	(17,755,000)	(17,755,000)	−335,000		
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	1,438,000	1,550,000	1,505,000	1,530,000	1,517,500	−32,500	+12,500	−12,500
Expenses, Presidential transition		800,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	−400,000		
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	300,000	310,000	310,000	310,000	310,000			
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	(18,150,000)	(21,840,000)	(19,565,000)	(21,840,000)	(20,000,000)	(−1,840,000)	(+435,000)	(−1,840,000)
Working capital fund		200,000		100,000	100,000	−100,000	+100,000	
Total, General Services Administration	587,024,400	603,387,400	537,992,600	595,253,650	566,894,100	−36,493,300	+28,901,500	−28,359,550
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY								
Office of the Administrator:								
Salaries and expenses	15,525,000	16,915,000	15,525,000	15,925,000	15,725,000	−1,190,000	+200,000	−200,000
Urban planning grants	21,150,000	25,000,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	−22,650,000		
Urban studies and housing research	387,400	1,500,000	387,400	387,400	387,400	−1,112,600		
Mass transportation demonstration grants	5,000,000							
Administrative expenses, mass transportation demonstrations	(195,000)	200,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	−100,000		
Open-space land grants	15,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	−15,000,000		
Low-income housing demonstration programs	1,200,000	5,075,000		50,000	25,000	−5,050,000	+25,000	−25,000
Public works planning fund [1]	2,000,000	16,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	−12,000,000		
Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization)	100,000,000	265,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	−65,000,000		
Housing for the elderly fund	100,000,000	75,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	−50,000,000		
Total, Office of the Administrator	260,262,400	434,690,000	262,362,400	262,812,400	262,587,400	−172,102,600	+225,000	−225,000
Public Housing Administration:								
Annual contributons	197,000,000	214,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	−14,000,000		
Administrative expenses	15,484,000	16,670,000	15,484,000	16,084,000	15,784,000	−886,000	+300,000	−300,000
Total, Public Housing Administration	212,484,000	230,670,000	215,484,000	216,084,000	215,784,000	−14,886,000	+300,000	−300,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	472,746,400	665,360,000	477,846,400	478,896,400	478,371,400	−186,988,600	+525,000	−525,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	24,670,000	25,850,000	25,260,000	25,710,000	25,485,000	−365,000	+225,000	−225,000

Footnote at end of table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965 (H.R. 11296)—Continued

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964 and the estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1965—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended), and 1964 supplementals	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—continued								
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION								
Authorization								
Research and development $4,341,100,000	$3,926,000,000	$4,523,000,000		$4,413,594,000	$4,363,594,000	−$159,406,000	+$4,363,594,000	−$50,000,000
Construction of facilities 262,880,500	680,000,000	281,000,000		262,880,500	262,880,500	−18,119,500	+262,880,500	
Administrative operations 623,525,500	494,000,000	641,000,000		623,525,500	623,525,500	−17,474,500	+623,525,500	
Total 5,227,506,000								
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration [2]	5,100,000,000	5,445,000,000		5,300,000,000	5,250,000,000	−195,000,000	+5,250,000,000	−50,000,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY								
Operation and maintenance of properties	43,000	37,000	$37,000	37,000	37,000			
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION								
Salaries and expenses	353,200,000	487,620,000	420,400,000	420,400,000	420,400,000	−67,220,000		
RENEGOTIATION BOARD								
Salaries and expenses	2,550,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses	13,937,500	15,325,000	14,680,000	14,680,000	14,680,000	−645,000		
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM								
Salaries and expenses	40,578,000	43,020,000	39,440,000	40,578,000	40,009,000	−3,011,000	+569,000	−569,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION								
General operating expenses	159,750,000	155,524,000	155,000,000	155,250,000	155,125,000	−399,000	+125,000	−125,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	14,800,000	14,885,000	14,200,000	14,500,000	41,200,000	−685,000		−300,000
Medical and prosthetic research	33,742,000	36,987,000	36,000,000	38,000,000	37,000,000	+13,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
Medical care	1,091,643,000	1,115,935,000	1,115,935,000	1,115,935,000	1,115,935,000			
Compensation and pensions	3,951,000,000	3,963,000,000	3,963,000,000	3,963,000,000	3,963,000,000			
Readjustment benefits	67,000,000	39,600,000	34,600,000	39,600,000	37,100,000	−2,500,000	+2,500,000	−2,500,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	30,200,000	13,700,000	13,700,000	13,700,000	13,700,000			
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	76,796,000	107,000,000	91,233,000	98,733,000	98,103,000	−8,897,000	+6,870,000	−630,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	310,000	310,000	310,000	310,000	310,000			
Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund								
Loan guarantee revolving fund limitation on obligations)	(360,000,000)	Indefinite	(257,000,000)	Indefinite	(380,000,000)	(+380,000,000)	(+123,000,000)	(+380,000,000)
Total, Veterans' Administration	5,425,241,000	5,446,941,000	5,423,978,000	5,439,028,000	5,434,473,000	−12,468,000	+10,495,000	−4,555,000
Total, definite appropriations	13,242,600,550	14,221,511,400	8,091,698,000	13,585,956,500	13,427,591,500	−793,919,900	+5,335,893,500	−158,365,000
Total, indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales)	33,312,500	28,142,000	27,267,500	27,267,500	27,267,500	−874,500		
Total appropriations, title I	13,275,913,050	14,249,653,400	8,118,965,500	13,613,224,000	13,454,859,000	−794,794,400	+5,335,893,500	−158,365,000

[1] 1964 supplemental, $4,000,000.

[2] 1964 R. & D. supplemental, $141,000,000.

Corporations—Administrative and nonadministrative expenses

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 (as amended)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference allowance compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Administrative expenses	($2,430,000)	($3,825,000)	($3,670,000)	($3,825,000)	($3,747,500)	(−$77,500)	(+$77,500)	(−$77,500)
Nonadministrative expenses	(12,800,000)	(13,408,000)	(13,120,000)	(13,120,000)	(13,120,000)	(−288,000)		
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	(1,315,000)	(225,000)	(225,000)	(225,000)	(225,000)			
Housing and Home Finance Agency:								
College housing loans	(1,903,000)	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)	(1,900,000)			
Public facility loans	(1,220,000)	(1,300,000)	(1,220,000)	(1,220,000)	(1,220,000)	(−80,000)		
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	(135,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)			
Housing for the elderly	(885,000)	(1,150,000)	(915,000)	(915,000)	(915,000)	(−235,000)		
Federal National Mortgage Association	(8,750,000)	(8,800,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)			
Federal Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses	(9,500,000)	(10,375,000)	(9,000,000)	(10,375,000)	(9,687,500)	(−687,500)	(+687,500)	(−687,500)
Nonadministrative expenses	(76,565,000)	(79,750,000)	(75,000,000)	(78,750,000)	(78,000,000)	(−1,750,000)	(+3,000,000)	(−750,000)
Public Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses	(15,484,000)	(16,670,000)	(15,484,000)	(16,084,000)	(15,784,000)	(−886,000)	(+300,000)	(−300,000)
Nonadministrative expenses	(1,420,000)	(1,605,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(−185,000)		
Total administrative expenses	(132,407,000)	(139,118,000)	(130,564,000)	(136,444,000)	(134,629,000)	(−4,489,000)	(+4,065,000)	(−1,815,000)

NOTE.—1964 supplementals included in estimates:

HHFA: Public works planning fund $4,000,000

NASA: Research and development 141,000,000

Public Law 88-507
88th Congress, H. R. 11296
August 30, 1964

An Act

78 STAT. 640.

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, namely: Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1965.

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $500,000. 72 Stat. 427; 75 Stat. 46. 60 Stat. 810.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Emergency Planning, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of the Office; $4,600,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $400,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available until expended for studies and research to develop measures and plans for emergency preparedness and telecommunications.

State and Local Preparedness

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop State and local programs for the effective use in time of war of natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization Functions of Federal Agencies

For expenses necessary to assist other Federal agencies to perform civil defense and defense mobilization functions, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies

37-398 O - 64 - (380)

for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, $4,190,000.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Science and Technology, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $900,000.

60 Stat. 810.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855–1855g), authorizing assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

64 Stat. 1109.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil Defense

operation and maintenance

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out civil defense activities, including the hire of motor vehicles; and financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes, as authorized by law, $75,000,000, of which not to exceed $16,000,000 shall be available for allocation under section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and not to exceed $14,500,000 shall be available for management expenses for civil defense including not to exceed 1,000 positions.

72 Stat. 533.
50 USC app. 2286.

Research, Shelter Survey and Marking

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for civil defense, and for continuing shelter surveys, marking and stocking, $30,200,000, to remain available until expended.

General Provisions

Appropriations contained in this Act for carrying out civil defense activities shall not be available in excess of the limitations on appropriations contained in Section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2260).

64 Stat. 1257; 72 Stat. 534.

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for civil defense activities.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters except in construction of new buildings under the heading, "Construction, Public Buildings Projects", for the fiscal year 1965.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service

EMERGENCY HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for carrying out emergency planning and preparedness functions of the Public Health Service, and procurement, storage (including underground storage), distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense medical supplies and equipment authorized by section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., App. 2281(h)), $8,875,000, to remain available until expended. 64 Stat. 1249; 72 Stat. 532.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem; $10,607,500. 60 Stat. 810.

Payments to Air Carriers (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, including not to exceed $3,358,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations during the current fiscal year, $82,500,000, to remain available until expended. 72 Stat. 763.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $90,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; $21,996,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended. 5 USC 118i, 118k-118n. 41 USC 5. 5 USC 631 note.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943. 3 CFR, 1943-1948 Comp., p. 256.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive
22 USC 287 note. Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
60 Stat. 810. (5 U.S.C. 55a), $600,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by
63 Stat. 166; the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official
75 Stat. 339, 340. business away from their homes or regular places of business, including
5 USC 835 note. periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944,
58 Stat. 257; as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as
70 Stat. 607. amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775), $1,650,000.
64 Stat. 465;
72 Stat. 49.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (5 U.S.C.
73 Stat. 713. 3006), $10,650,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,138,000 of the funds in the "Employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001–3014), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS, RETIRED EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Retired employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to retired employees, as authorized by section 4 of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits
74 Stat. 850. Act (5 U.S.C. 3053), $14,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, without regard to the provisions of any other Act, not to exceed $348,000 of the funds in the "Retired employees health benefits fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3051–3060), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the estimated cost of new and increased annuity benefits, during the current fiscal year, as provided by Part III of Public Law 87-793 (76 Stat. 868), $65,000,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund. 5 USC 2259 and note, 2260, 2268.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed $273,500 of the funds in the "Employees life insurance fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided*, That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)). 68 Stat. 736. 60 Stat. 810. 69 Stat. 678. 72 Stat. 87.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed $10,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; purchase of fourteen passenger motor vehicles, including ten for replacement only; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; $542,600,000: *Provided*, That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $6,200,000 or include in excess of 406 positions: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities. 60 Stat. 170. 49 USC 1101 note.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); and purchase of eight aircraft; $50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of a new wind tunnel.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

49 USC 1101-1111 passim.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

For grants-in-aid for airports pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended, as follows: for the purposes of section 5(d)(4) of such Act: $66,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; for the purposes of section 5(d)(5) of such Act, $1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966; and for the purposes of section 5(d)(6) of such Act, $7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

Ante, p. 159.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1301–1542), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, $40,000,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 731.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $3,565,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for police type use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $4,319,000.

CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, $1,710,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Dulles International Airport, $180,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and

63 Stat. 907.

aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131). 68 Stat. 1114.

Money hereafter recovered from the pool and fountain at Dulles International Airport shall not be subject to the Act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484m, 485a), and may be given to a nonprofit organization which, in the determination of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, promotes and provides for the welfare of travelers in air commerce. 63 Stat. 388; 69 Stat. 430.

Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditure by the Federal Aviation Agency may be expended for reimbursement of other Federal agencies for expenses incurred, on behalf of the Federal Aviation Agency, in the settlement of claims for damages resulting from sonic boom in connection with research conducted as part of the civil supersonic aircraft development.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed $85,400), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $14,500), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, $16,385,000. 60 Stat. 810.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, $12,439,500.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $12,875,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for an economic questionnaire or financial study of intercorporate relations.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Operating Expenses, Public Buildings Service

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings and moving; $219,185,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to provide such fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other removable facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its function of protecting the person of the President of the United States and his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President pursuant to Title 18, U.S.C. 3056; 65 Stat. 122; 76 Stat. 956. *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be used after January 1, 1965, to finance the cost of any new or expanded space requirement of any department or agency, including moving, rental, alteration, equipment, or any other cost relating thereto, which has not previously been funded by transfer of funds to the General Services Administration to cover such costs for at least one full fiscal year.

Repair and Improvement of Public Buildings

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) and to alter other Federally-owned buildings and to acquire additions to sites thereof, including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; $90,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) and the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 (39 U.S.C. 2104 et seq.), and buildings under the control of another department or agency where alteration of such buildings is required in connection with the moving of such other department or agency from buildings then, or thereafter to be, under the control of General Services Administration shall be considered to be public buildings. 40 USC 601 note. 68 Stat. 518, 521; 74 Stat. 590.

Construction, Public Buildings Projects

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct and acquire public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of $200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including fallout shelters (in new buildings only) and equipment for such buildings, $153,167,000, and not to exceed $500,000 of this amount shall be available to the Administrator for construction or alteration of small public buildings outside the District of Columbia as the Administrator approves and deems necessary, all to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows: Fallout shelters.

Federal office building, Centre, Alabama, $144,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Cullman, Alabama, $417,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Vernon, Alabama, $169,900;
Post office and Federal office building, Hope, Arkansas, $311,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Marshall, Arkansas, $178,100;
Post office and Federal office building, McCrory, Arkansas, $91,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Mountain Home, Arkansas, $179,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Blythe, California, $306,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Del Mar, California, $146,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Harbor City, California, $152,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Jackson, California, $255,600;
Customs and appraisers warehouse, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, California, in addition to the sum heretofore provided, $2,572,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Solana Beach, California, $146,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Weed, California, $126,700;
Federal office building, West Los Angeles, California, $13,204,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, $312,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Leadville, Colorado, $176,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Windsor Locks, Connecticut, $240,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Cross City, Florida, $141,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Oakland Park Branch, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, $152,800;
Federal office building, Jacksonville, Florida, $6,383,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Gratigny Branch, Miami, Florida, $204,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Ocoee, Florida, $124,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Acworth, Georgia, $127,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Chatsworth, Georgia, $208,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Toccoa, Georgia, $282,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Warm Springs, Georgia, $70,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Arthur, Illinois, $110,600;
Federal office building, East St. Louis, Illinois, $810,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Edwardsville, Illinois, $342,900;
Post office and Federal office building, Red Bud, Illinois, $94,600;
Courthouse and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, $1,981,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Evansville, Indiana, $1,614,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Scottsburg, Indiana, $232,900;
Post office and Federal office building, Shoals, Indiana, $119,700;
Federal office building, Des Moines, Iowa, $8,050,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Scott City, Kansas, $281,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Wellington, Kansas, $259,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Clinton, Kentucky, $185,300;
Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Covington, Kentucky, $3,438,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Cumberland, Kentucky, $102,200;

Post office and Federal office building, Olive Hill, Kentucky, $148,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Paris, Kentucky, $218,100;
Federal office building, Richmond, Kentucky, $160,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Russell Springs, Kentucky, $86,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, $3,487,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Crowley, Louisiana, $303,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Gueydan, Louisiana, $101,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Mamou, Louisiana, $72,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Mansura, Louisiana, $80,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Oberlin, Louisiana, $97,400;
Post office and courthouse, Opelousas, Louisiana, $954,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Thibodaux, Louisiana, $263,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Calais, Maine, $278,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Lubec, Maine, $104,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Machias, Maine, $220,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Centreville, Maryland, $205,000;
Post office and Federal office building, North East, Maryland, $114,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Prince Frederick, Maryland, $185,900;
Central heating plant, Suitland, Maryland, $3,213,000;
General Services Administration, Federal records center, Boston, Massachusetts, $883,800;
Treasury Regional Service Center (Internal Revenue Service), Boston-Lawrence area, Massachusetts, $3,748,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Marlboro, Massachusetts, $242,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Milford, Massachusetts, $274,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Springfield, Massachusetts, $2,804,500;
Internal Revenue Service National Administrative Service Center and Regional Training Center Building, Detroit, Michigan, $2,925,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Lawton, Michigan, $89,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Mancelona, Michigan, $94,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Baudette, Minnesota, $159,700;
Courthouse and Federal office building, St. Paul, Minnesota, $9,120,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Bay Springs, Mississippi, $154,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Coldwater, Mississippi, $83,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Port Gibson, Mississippi, $154,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Richton, Mississippi, $80,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Branson, Missouri, $142,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Crystal City, Missouri, $125,900;
Post office and Federal office building, Montgomery City, Missouri, $248,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Fullerton, Nebraska, $178,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Gothenburg, Nebraska, $147,800;

Post office and courthouse, Carson City, Nevada, $1,956,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Berlin, New Hampshire, $317,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Avenel, New Jersey, $133,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Burlington, New Jersey, $261,800;
Federal office building, Newark, New Jersey, $12,230,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Raton, New Mexico, $319,000;
Federal office building, Buffalo, New York, $11,145,900;
Post office and Federal office building, Keeseville, New York, $106,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Andrews, North Carolina, $105,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Cary, North Carolina, $111,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Jacksonville, North Carolina, $274,700;
Federal office building, Kinston, North Carolina, $164,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Mars Hill, North Carolina, $101,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Raeford, North Carolina, $226,900;
Post office and Federal office building, Rich Square, North Carolina, $87,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Waynesville, North Carolina, $401,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Windsor, North Carolina, $151,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Hillsboro, Ohio, $337,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Mantua, Ohio, $154,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Afton, Oklahoma, $107,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Elk City, Oklahoma, $222,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Hugo, Oklahoma, $269,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Jay, Oklahoma, $174,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Baker, Oregon, $1,176,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Enterprise, Oregon, $195,900;
Post office and Federal office building, Prineville, Oregon, $252,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Scappoose, Oregon, $125,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Berwick, Pennsylvania, $267,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Brookeville, Pennsylvania, $154,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Dallas, Pennsylvania, $151,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Duncannon, Pennsylvania, $92,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Falls Creek, Pennsylvania, $96,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Galeton, Pennsylvania, $119,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Hawley, Pennsylvania, $151,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Irwin, Pennsylvania, $224,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Montrose, Pennsylvania, $151,700;
Post office and Federal office building, New Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, $154,400;

Post office and Federal office building, Cedarhurst Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Green Tree Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Pleasant Hills Branch, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $182,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Youngsville, Pennsylvania, $96,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Humacao, Puerto Rico, $181,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Olneyville Station, Providence, Rhode Island, $235,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Elloree, South Carolina, $87,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Ridgeland, South Carolina, $246,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Williston, South Carolina, $91,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Oneida, Tennessee, $131,800;
Post office and Federal office building, Buffalo, Texas, $86,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Carthage, Texas, $235,600;
Post office and Federal office building, Fairfield, Texas, $168,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Gonzales, Texas, $224,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Naples, Texas, $104,100;
Post office and Federal office building, Sulphur Springs, Texas, $279,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Heber, Utah, $161,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Provo, Utah, $378,000;
Post office and Federal office building, St. Johnsbury, Vermont, $335,000;
Franconia warehouse building, Franconia, Virginia, $5,800,000;
Post office and Federal office building, Cle Elum, Washington, $120,200;
Federal office building, Colville, Washington, $393,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Newport, Washington, $136,700;
Courthouse and Federal office building, Spokane, Washington, $6,502,500;
Federal office building, Vancouver, Washington, $426,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Gassaway, West Virginia, $115,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Glenville, West Virginia, $159,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Parsons, West Virginia, $171,200;
Post office and Federal office building, Pineville, West Virginia, $157,500;
Post office and Federal office building, Summersville, West Virginia, $232,200;
Post office and Federal office building, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, $129,300;
Post office and Federal office building, Eagle River, Wisconsin, $152,700;
Post office and Federal office building, Elroy, Wisconsin, $113,400;
Post office and Federal office building, Horicon, Wisconsin, $120,800;
Housing and Home Finance Agency building, District of Columbia, $26,108,100:

Provided further, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to

exceed 10 per centum: *Provided further*, That the amount of $840,300 appropriated under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1961 and 1962, for projects at Vanceboro, Maine, Pembina, North Dakota, and Wyandotte, Michigan, is hereby made available for the purposes of this appropriation, and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the Post Office and Federal office building at Augusta, Maine, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, is hereby increased by $460,000 and the maximum construction improvement cost for construction of the border station facility at Derby Line, Vermont, provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962, is hereby increased by $183,000. 74 Stat. 431; 75 Stat. 349. 76 Stat. 724. 75 Stat. 349.

Not to exceed $120,000 heretofore appropriated under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects", in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963, may be transferred to the appropriation for "Construction, United States Mission Building, New York, New York", for the payment of contractor's claims.

Sites and Expenses, Public Buildings Projects

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, $20,109,000, to remain available until expended. 72 Stat. 1066; 73 Stat. 505.

Payments, Public Buildings Purchase Contracts

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), $9,885,000. 68 Stat. 518.

Expenses, United States Court Facilities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to provide, directly or indirectly, additional space for the United States Courts incident to expansion of facilities (including rental of buildings in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and moving and space adjustments), and furniture and furnishings; $1,030,600.

Operating Expenses, Federal Supply Service

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for supply distribution, procurement, inspection, operation of the stores depot system (including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items), and other supply management and related activities, as authorized by law, $50,670,000.

Operating Expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property, and rehabilitation of personal property, as authorized by law, $9,512,500, to be derived from proceeds from the transfer of excess property and the disposal of surplus property.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, $15,055,000, including $25,000 which shall be available for continuing to carry out the purposes of Sec. 2 of Public Law 88–195 approved December 11, 1963, for the period ending June 30, 1965.

77 Stat. 348.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation, communications, and other public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $5,465,000.

60 Stat. 810.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h), during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and other materials acquired for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), not to exceed $1,500,000 for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including reimbursement for security guard services, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $2,937,500 for operating expenses, $17,755,000, to be derived from sales of strategic and critical materials: *Provided*, That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year the General Services Administration is authorized to acquire leasehold interests in property, for periods not in excess of twenty years, for the storage, security, and maintenance of strategic, critical, and other materials and equipment held pursuant to the aforesaid Act provided said leasehold interests are at nominal cost to the Government: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further*, That any receipts from sales during the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury except as otherwise provided herein: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year materials in the inventory maintained under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and, after compliance with the disposal requirements of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, excess materials in the national stockpile established pursuant to that Act, shall be available, without reimbursement, for transfer at fair market value to contractors as payment for expenses of refining, processing, or otherwise beneficiating materials, pursuant to section 3(c) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, into a form best suitable for stockpiling.

73 Stat. 607.

62 Stat. 1225.

60 Stat. 598.

64 Stat. 798.

50 USC app. 2061.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, $1,517,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed $500 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

EXPENSES, PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (78 Stat. 153), $400,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $310,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act. 3 USC 102 note.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited into said account for the current fiscal year from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed $20,000,000: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

To increase the capital of the working capital fund established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), $100,000. 59 Stat. 115; 63 Stat. 380.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. 61 Stat. 584. 62 Stat. 1225.

Appropriations to the General Services Administration under the heading "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" made in this Act

shall be available, subject to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for (1) acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, (2) extension or conversion of Government-owned buildings, and (3) construction of new buildings, in addition to those set forth under that appropriation: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize an expenditure of funds for acquisition, extension or conversion, or construction without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

73 Stat. 479.
40 USC 601 note.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

63 Stat. 377.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

40 USC 471 note.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for (a) reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law, and (b) transfer or reimbursement to applicable appropriations to said Administration for rents and related expenses, not otherwise provided for, of providing subject to Executive Order 11035, dated July 9, 1962, directly or indirectly, suitable general purpose space for any such department or agency, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere.

40 USC 490 note.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies at an estimated cost of construction in excess of $200,000 or for the payment of the salary of any person who executes such a lease agreement: *Provided*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for the lease construction of space has been submitted to and approved by the appropriate Committees of the Congress in the same manner as for public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles including one at not to exceed $4,000 and one for replacement only; $15,725,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year non-administrative expenses, as defined by law (77 Stat. 437), shall not exceed $3,375,000.

60 Stat. 810.

12 USC 1749d.

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $2,350,000. 73 Stat. 678. 40 USC 461.

URBAN STUDIES AND HOUSING RESEARCH

For urban studies and housing research as authorized by the Housing Acts of 1948 and 1956, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, $387,400. 62 Stat. 1268; 70 Stat. 1091. 12 USC 1747 note, 1703 note.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, MASS TRANSPORTATION DEMONSTRATIONS

For necessary expenses in connection with mass transportation demonstration projects, as authorized by section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $100,000. 63 Stat. 416. 42 USC 1453.

OPEN SPACE LAND GRANTS

For expenses in connection with grants to aid in the acquisition of open-space land or interests therein, and with the provision of technical assistance to State and local public bodies (including the undertaking of studies and publication of information), $15,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $262,000 may be used for administrative expenses and technical assistance, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with grants requiring payments in excess of the amount herein appropriated therefor.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, LOW INCOME HOUSING DEMONSTRATIONS

For necessary expenses in connection with low income housing demonstration projects, as authorized by section 207 of the Housing Act of 1961, $25,000. 75 Stat. 165. 42 USC 1436.

PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), $1,000,000, together with such additional sums not to exceed $3,000,000 as may be necessary to restore to said revolving fund the amounts which are not required to be repaid pursuant to section 702(g) of the Housing Act of 1954, as added by section 6 of the Public Works Acceleration Act (40 U.S.C. 462g), to be immediately available. 69 Stat. 641. 76 Stat. 544.

URBAN RENEWAL FUND (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $200,000,000. 63 Stat. 416; 75 Stat. 166, 167.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY FUND

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), $25,000,000. 73 Stat. 667.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of
50 Stat. 891. 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), $200,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, $15,784,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of Augus
60 Stat. 810. 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $10 per diem; and purchase of not to exceed thirty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $25,485,000, of which not less than $1,889,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $1,261,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administratio $4,363,594,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For advance planning, design, and construction of facilities for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, $262,880,500, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of Septem-
68 Stat. 1114. ber 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; purchase or hire of not to exceed two aircraft for administrative use; maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase and hire of motor vehicles (including purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which forty shall be for replacement only); and

maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; $623,525,500.

General Provisions

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation.

Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation "Administrative Operations" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without the consent of the Congress.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Operation and Maintenance of Properties

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, $37,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective. 48 Stat. 930. D. C. Code 5-111. 64 Stat. 81.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase, maintenance and operation of one aircraft; hire of one aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $420,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than $37,600,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the government for research without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. 64 Stat. 149. 72 Stat. 275.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $2,600,000. 60 Stat. 810.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $14,680,000.

68 Stat. 1114.
60 Stat. 810.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); hire of motor vehicles; purchase of thirteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $38,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; $40,009,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

50 USC app. 451 note.

31 USC 665.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for and recognition of war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; reimbursement of the Department of the Army for the services of the officer assigned to the Veterans Administration to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; $155,125,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

Medical Administration and Miscellaneous Operating Expenses

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, construction and supply, research, employee education and training activities, as authorized by law, $14,200,000.

Medical and Prosthetic Research

For expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $37,000,000, of which $1,275,000 shall be for prosthetic research and development activities.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, and furnishing recreational articles and facilities; maintenance, operation and acquisition of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of eighty-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code; $1,115,935,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

68 Stat. 1114.
Ante, p. 500.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, burial flags, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, and for payment of amounts of compromises or settlements under 28 U.S.C. 2677 of tort claims potentially subject to the offset provisions of 38 U.S.C. 351, $3,963,000,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 1169.
43 Stat. 125, 128.
62 Stat. 984.
72 Stat. 1124; 76 Stat. 950.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1(a), as saved from repeal by section 12(a) of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1264), and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, $37,100,000, to remain available until expended.

38 USC note prec. pt. 1.
72 Stat. 1167 et seq.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, $13,700,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for

any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, $98,103,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Texas, is reduced from "$2,000,000" to "$1,990,000".

72 Stat. 1251.
70 Stat. 350.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, $310,000.

72 Stat. 1145.

LOAN GUARANTY REVOLVING FUND

During the current fiscal year, the Loan guaranty revolving fund shall be available for expenses, but not to exceed $380,000,000, for property acquisitions and other loan guaranty and insurance operations under Chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, except administrative expenses, as authorized by section 1824 of such title: *Provided*, That the retained earnings of the Direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to said Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amounts as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses: *Provided further*, That, in addition, not to exceed $200,000,000 of unobligated balances of said Direct loans revolving fund shall be available, during the current fiscal year, for transfer to the Loan guaranty revolving fund in such amount as may be necessary to provide for the foregoing expenses and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not be required to pay interest on amounts so transferred after the time of such transfer.

72 Stat. 1203; 74 Stat. 532. 38 USC 1801-1825.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

60 Stat. 810.

The appropriation available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Medical care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

72 Stat. 1169.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board, to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules. Travel expenses.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto. Positions of employees entering Armed Forces.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor. Real estate purchase or sale, restriction.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the current fiscal year for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided: 61 Stat. 584. 31 USC 849.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

LIMITATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Not to exceed a total of $3,747,500 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which may procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and contracts for such services with one organization may be renewed annually, and uniforms or allowances therefor in accordance with the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131–2133), and said amount shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may 60 Stat. 810. 68 Stat. 1114.

make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 6(i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act or under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further*, That expenses of any functions of supervision (except of Federal home-loan banks) vested in or exercisable by the Board shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449): *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses (except those included in the first proviso hereof) for the supervision and examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed $13,120,000 for not to exceed 1,000 positions.

47 Stat. 729.
12 USC 1426.
68 Stat. 634.
12 USC 1464.
64 Stat. 259; 73 Stat. 691.
12 USC 1730, 1730a.
47 Stat. 725.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $225,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 or 408 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730a).

48 Stat. 1255; 73 Stat. 691.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, College Housing Loans

Not to exceed $1,900,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831). 64 Stat. 77. 64 Stat. 873.

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, Public Facility Loans

Not to exceed $1,220,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831). 69 Stat. 642. 42 USC 1491–1497.

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, Revolving Fund (Liquidating Programs)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $110,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

Limitation on Administrative and Nonadministrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, Housing for the Elderly

Not to exceed $915,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.), shall be available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831). 73 Stat. 667.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed $8,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $9,687,500 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with
48 Stat. 1246. the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September
68 Stat. 1114. 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed $1,500): *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2
63 Stat. 905. of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed
12 USC 1702. $78,000,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–
50 Stat. 888. 1433), including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Admin-

istration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed $1,420,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Publicity or propaganda.

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

Personnel work.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

Research projects.
Indirect expenses.

SEC. 303. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program.

Short title.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1965".

Approved August 30, 1964.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 1413 (Comm. on Appropriations) and No. 1781 (Comm. of Conference).
SENATE REPORT No. 1269 (Comm. on Appropriations).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 110 (1964):
May 20, 21: Considered in House.
May 21: Passed House.
Aug. 5: Considered and passed Senate, amended.
Aug. 13: House agreed to conference report with certain amendments.
Aug. 14: Senate agreed to conference report; concurred in House amendments.